

Version 01 Codebook

CODEBOOK INTRODUCTION FILE
1990 POST-ELECTION STUDY
(1990.TV)

AMERICAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES

1990 POST ELECTION STUDY

Principal Investigators

Warren E. Miller
Donald R. Kinder
Steven J. Rosenstone
and the National Election Studies

Center for Political Studies
University of Michigan

ICPSR ARCHIVE NUMBER 9548

□

BIBLIOGRAPHIC CITATION

Publications based on ICPSR data collections should acknowledge those sources by means of bibliographic citations. To ensure that such source attributions are captured for social science bibliographic utilities, citations must appear in footnotes or in the reference section of publications. The bibliographic citation for this data collection is:

Miller, Warren E., Donald R. Kinder, Steven J. Rosenstone, and the National Election Studies. AMERICAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY, 1990: POST-ELECTION SURVEY [Computer file]. Conducted by University of Michigan, Center for Political Studies. 2nd ICPSR ed. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [producer and distributor], 1992.

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION ON USE OF ICPSR RESOURCES

To provide funding agencies with essential information about use of archival resources and to facilitate the exchange of information about ICPSR participants' research activities, users of ICPSR data are requested to send to ICPSR bibliographic citations for each completed manuscript or thesis abstract. Please indicate in a cover letter which data were used.

DATA DISCLAIMER

The original collector of the data, ICPSR, and the relevant funding agency bear no responsibility for uses of this collection or for interpretations or inferences based upon such uses.

□

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Note: >>sections in the codebook introduction and codebook appendix can be navigated in the machine-readable files by searching ">>".

INTRODUCTORY MATERIAL (file int1990.cbk)

>> 1990 STUDY DESCRIPTION

```
>> 1990 SURVEY CONTENT AND ADMINISTRATION
>> 1990 SAMPLING INFORMATION
>> 1990 VOTE VALIDATION AND ELECTION ADMINISTRATION SURVEY DATA
>> 1990 NES STAFF AND TECHNICAL PAPER
>> 1990 LIST OF PILOT STUDY REPORTS-1989
>> 1990 CODEBOOK INFORMATION
>> 1990 ICPSR PROCESSING INFORMATION
>> 1990 VARIABLE DESCRIPTION LIST
```

CODEBOOK

```
-----
```

1990 variables

APPENDICES (file app1990.cbk)

```
-----
```

```
>> 1980 CENSUS DEFINITIONS
>> 1990 PARTY/CANDIDATE MASTER CODE
>> 1990 CAMPAIGN ISSUES MASTER CODE
>> 1990 CANDIDATE NUMBER CODE AND LIST
>> 1990 IMPORTANT PROBLEMS MASTER CODE
>> 1990 PARTY DIFFERENCES MASTER CODE
>> 1990 RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE MASTER CODE
>> 1980 CENSUS OCCUPATION CODE
>> 1980 CENSUS INDUSTRY CODE
>> 1990 ICPSR OCCUPATION RECODES
>> 1990 NATIONALITY AND ETHNIC CODE
>> 1990 STATE AND COUNTRY CODE
>> CITIES WITH POPULATION OF 25,000 AND OVER, 1990 Study
```

□

```
>> 1990 STUDY DESCRIPTION
```

The NES/CPS American National Election Study 1990 was conducted by the Center for Political Studies of the Institute for Social Research, under the general direction of principal investigators Warren E. Miller, Donald R. Kinder and Steven J. Rosenstone. Santa Traugott is the Project Manager for the National Election Studies. Giovanna Morchio was the 1990 Election Study manager for NES, overseeing the study from very early planning stages through data release.

This is the twenty-first in a series of studies of American national elections produced by the Political Behavior Program of the Survey Research Center and the Center for Political Studies, and it is the seventh such study to be conducted under the auspices of National Science Foundation Grants providing long-term support for the national election studies. Both the 1990 National Election Study and the Vote Validation Study were funded under grant number SES-8808361. Since 1978 the NES election studies have been designed by a National Board of Overseers, the members of which meet several times a year to plan content and administration of the major study components.

Board members during the planning of the 1990 National Election Study included: Morris P. Fiorina, Harvard

University, Chair; Richard A. Brody, Stanford University; Stanley Feldman, University of Kentucky; Edie N. Goldenberg, University of Michigan; Mary Jackman, University of California at Davis, Gary C. Jacobson, University of California at San Diego; Stanley Kelley, Jr., Princeton University; Thomas Mann, The Brookings Institution; Douglas Rivers, Stanford University; John Zaller, the University of California at Los Angeles; Warren E. Miller, Arizona State University, ex officio; Donald R. Kinder, and Steven J. Rosenstone, University of Michigan, ex officio.

As part of the planning process, a special planning committee was appointed, a pilot study conducted, and stimulus letters sent to the members of the scholarly community soliciting input on study plans. The 1990 Study Planning Committee included Kinder and Miller, several Board members (Mann, Co-chair; Brody; Feldman; Jackman; Miller, ex officio; and Rosenstone, ex officio and Co-chair), and four other scholars (Jon Krosnick, Ohio State University; Gregory Markus and Vincent Price, University of Michigan; and David Leege, Notre Dame University).

A two-wave pilot study was carried out in July and September of 1989 for the purpose of developing new instrumentation for the 1990 Election Study. New items were tested in the area of religious attitudes and denominational affiliation, media exposure and the type of information recalled, and individualism. A significant portion of the study was devoted to experiments contrasting different instrumentation for issue questions: seven-point scales versus branching response alternatives; "framed" versus "stripped" questions; unipolar versus bipolar scales; and filtered versus unfiltered questions. Data from the 1989 Pilot Study are available through the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR 9295). Results from the pilot study (as summarized in Pilot Study Reports, page xix) were used by the Planning Committee in formulating recommendations to the Board about study content for the 1990 Election Study.

The 1991 membership of the NES Board of Overseers is: Stanley Feldman, State University of New York, Stony Brook; Morris J. Fiorina, Harvard University; Mary Jackman, University of California, Davis; Gary Jacobson, University of California, San Diego; David Leege, Notre Dame University; Thomas Mann, The Brookings Institution; Douglas Rivers, Stanford University; John Zaller, University of California, Los Angeles.

□>> 1990 SURVEY CONTENT AND ADMINISTRATION

SURVEY CONTENT

The Board of Overseers balanced a number of considerations in selecting content for the Post-Election Survey. There was, as always, the necessity of maintaining continuity with

past surveys. All congressional time-series items were evaluated by the Board, and input was solicited from the user community about whether each should be used for the 1990 Study.

The items that fall into the time-series, or "core" category, are: campaign attention; likes and dislikes of political parties; likes and dislikes of congressional candidates; contact with Congressperson or candidate; vote for Representative, Senator and Governor; most important problem; campaign activities; system support and efficacy items; feeling thermometer ratings of congressional candidates and groups; retrospective economic evaluations (national and individual); liberal-conservative scale (with proximities); party identification, seven-point issue scales with placements; federal budget preferences; views on abortion; and the standard and extensive battery of demographic questions.

A number of questions are new or relatively new to the Study. Some came from the piloting work described above-- e.g., the new measures of denominational affiliation; individualism; and attitudes toward abortion and discrimination against women. Others were designed to reflect topical concerns of the campaign. Items in this category include some foreign policy issue items relating to changes in Eastern Europe and to events in the Persian Gulf; and knowledge of and attitudes about the failures of the savings and loans financial institutions and about the federal budget deficit.

SURVEY ADMINISTRATION

Two forms were used in order to incorporate the maximum amount of content. (Even so, the average length of the survey interview was 78 minutes.) Half of the study sample was randomly assigned to Form A, and the other half to Form B. More than 75 percent of the questionnaire content was the same in both forms; Form A had additional questions relating to values and individualism; Form B had additional content relating to foreign relations. In addition, there was a question form experiment (branching alternatives vs. a seven-point scale).

In the Post-election survey, respondents are asked lengthy series of questions about their particular Congresspersons and Senators. Interviewers must pre-edit questionnaires to fill in the names appropriate for the state and congressional district in which the respondent is living (or was living during the pre-election interview). Interviewers are sent "candidate lists" for each congressional district in the sample segments in which they are interviewing. Each candidate and Senator on that list is assigned a particular number that reflects his or her incumbency status and party. (See Candidate Number Code) Particular questions in the survey require the insertion by the interviewer during pre-editing of the names of candidates with specific numbers. See, for example, Q. B13, the Feeling Thermometer. The Candidate Lists used by the interviewers, which show which candidates are associated

with which congressional district and with which numbers they are tagged, can be found in the Appendix (Note 4) of this documentation.

NOTES ON CONFIDENTIAL VARIABLES

Starting with the 1986 Election Study, occupation code variables have been released in somewhat less detail than in years past. The dataset includes a two-digit code with 71 categories corresponding to Census Bureau occupational groupings. Those who have need of the full occupation code for their research should contact the NES project staff for information about the conditions under which access to these data may be provided.

Similarly, the National Election Studies have not included information for census tracts or minor civil divisions since 1978. Permission to use the more detailed geographic information for scholarly research may be obtained from the Board of Overseers. More information about this is available from NES project staff.

Coding of the new religious denomination variable is in some cases based on an alphabetic "other, please specify" variable (Variable 541). This variable is restricted for reasons of confidentiality, but access may be provided to legitimate scholars under established NES procedures.

OPEN-ENDED MATERIALS

Traditionally, the Election Studies have contained several minutes of open-ended responses (for example, the congressional candidates likes and dislikes). These questions are put into Master Codes by the SRC coding section. Other scholars have developed alternative or supplemental coding schemes for the questions (for example, the levels of conceptualization, released as ICPSR #8151). The Board of Overseers wishes to encourage these efforts but in ways that respect the NES and SRC obligation to protect the privacy and anonymity of respondents. Circumstances under which individuals may have access to transcribed versions of these questions have been worked out and those interested should contact the NES project staff for further details.

Table 1

FIELD ADMINISTRATION INFORMATION

Response Rate:	71.4%
Length of Interview:	78.0 min
No. of Respondents:	2000

Table 2

NUMBER AND CUMULATIVE PERCENT OF INTERVIEWS IN
TWO-WEEK INTERVALS FROM ELECTION DAY, 1990

Nov. 07-Nov. 17	836	42%
Nov. 18-Dec. 01	594	72%
Dec. 02-Dec. 22	413	92%
Dec. 23-Jan. 05	106	97%
Jan. 06-Jan. 26	51	100%

□>> 1990 SAMPLING INFORMATION [1]

STUDY POPULATION

The study population for the 1990 NES is defined to include all United States citizens of voting age on or before the 1990 Election Day. Eligible citizens must have resided in housing units, other than on military reservations, in the 48 coterminous states. This definition excludes persons living in Alaska or Hawaii and requires eligible persons to have been both a United States citizen and 18 years of age on or before the 6th of November 1990.

MULTI-STAGE AREA PROBABILITY SAMPLE DESIGN

The 1990 NES is based on a multi-stage area probability sample selected from the Survey Research Center's (SRC) National Sample design. Identification of the 1990 NES sample respondents was conducted using a four-stage sampling process--a primary stage sampling of U.S. Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA's) and counties, followed by a second stage sampling of area segments, a third stage sampling of housing units within sampled area segments, and concluding with the random selection of a single respondent from selected housing units. A detailed documentation of the SRC National Sample is provided in the SRC publication titled 1980 SRC NATIONAL SAMPLE: DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT.

Primary Stage Selection

The selection of primary stage sampling units (PSU's), [2] which depending on the sample stratum are either SMSA's, single counties or groupings of small counties, is based on the county-level 1980 Census Reports of Population and Housing. Primary stage units were assigned to 84 explicit

strata based on SMSA/Non-SMSA status, PSU size, and geographic location. Sixteen of the 84 strata contain only a single self-representing PSU, each of which is included with certainty in the primary stage of sample selection. The remaining 68 nonself-representing strata contain more than

[1] Technical description of the 1990 National Election Study Sample Design prepared by the Sampling Section of the Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, February 1991.

[2] In SRC publications and survey materials, the term "primary area" is used interchangeably with the more common "primary stage unit" terminology.

one PSU. From each of these nonself-representing strata, one PSU was sampled with probability proportionate to its size (PPS) measured in 1980 occupied housing units. The full SRC National Sample of 84 primary stage selections was designed to be optimal for surveys roughly two times the size of the 1990 NES. To permit the flexibility needed for optimal design of smaller survey samples, the primary stage of the SRC National Sample can be readily partitioned into smaller subsamples of PSU's. Each of the partitions represents a stratified subselection from the full 84 PSU design.

The sample for the 1990 NES is selected from the "one-half" partition of the 1980 SRC National Sample. The "one-half sample" includes 11 of the 16 self-representing SMSA PSU's and a stratified subsampling of 34 (of the 68) nonself-representing PSU's of the SRC National Sample. Table 3 identifies the PSU's for the 1990 National Election Study by SMSA status and Region.

Second Stage Selection of Area Segments

The second stage of the 1980 National Sample was selected directly from computerized files that were prepared from the 1980 Census summary tape file series (STF1-B). The designated second-stage sampling units (SSU's), termed "area segments," are comprised of census blocks in the metropolitan primary areas and enumeration districts (ED's) in the rural non-SMSA's and rural areas of SMSA primary areas. Each SSU block, block combination or enumeration district was assigned a measure of size equal to the total 1980 occupied housing unit count for the area (minimum = 50). Second stage sampling of area segments was performed with probabilities proportionate to the assigned measures of size.

A three-step process of ordering the SSU's within the primary areas produced an implicit stratification of the area segments in the second stage sampling frame, stratified at the county level by geographic location and population. Area segments were stratified within county at the Minor

Civil Division (MCD) level by size and income, and at the block and ED level by location within the MCD or county. (For details, refer to the SRC publication, 1980 NATIONAL SAMPLE: DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT.)

Systematic PPS sampling was used to select the area segments from the second stage sampling frame for each county. In the self-representing (SR) PSU's the number of sample area segments varied in proportion to the size of the primary stage unit, from a high of b=18 area segments in the SR New York SMSA to a low of b=7 area segments in the smaller SR PSU's such as San Francisco. A total of b=6 area segments

Table 3

PSU'S IN THE 1990 NES POST-ELECTION SURVEY
by: SMSA Status and Region

REGION	SMSA STATUS		
	Self-representing SMSA's	Non self-representing SMSA's	Non-SMSA's

North-east	New York, NY-NJ Philadelphia, PA-NJ	Boston, MA* Pittsburgh, PA* Buffalo, NY New Haven, CT Atlantic City, NJ Manchester, NH	Schuyler, NY
North Central	Chicago, IL Detroit, MI	St. Louis, MO* Milwaukee, WI Dayton, OH Des Moines, IA Grand Rapids, MI Fort Wayne, IN Steubenville, OH	Sanilac, MI Phillips, KS Mower, MN
South		Houston, TX* Baltimore, MD* Birmingham, AL Columbus, GA-AL Miami, FL Lakeland, FL McAllen, TX Wheeling, WV Knoxville, TN Richmond, VA	Bulloch, GA Hale, TX Monroe, AR Bedford, TN Robeson, NC
West	Los Angeles, CA San Francisco, CA	Seattle, WA Denver, WY Anaheim, CA Fresno, CA Eugene, OR	Eldorado- Albine, CA Carbon, WY

NOTE: The PSU's marked with an asterisk (*) are Self-Representing for sample designs that use the two-thirds or larger portion of the sample. For the half-sample design, only 6 of the 16 Self-Representing areas remain Self-Representing. The other ten Self-Representing PSU's are paired and only five are used in the half-sample design, each representing both itself and the PSU it is paired with.

was selected from each of the a=39 nonself-representing (NSR) PSU's (except Houston that had 7 segments selected). A total of 303 segments were selected, 68 in the six self-representing PSU's and 235 in the nonself-representing PSU's.

Third Stage Selection of Housing Units

For each area segment selected in the second sampling stage, a listing was made of all housing units located within the physical boundaries of the segment. For segments with a very large number of expected housing units, all housing units in a subselected part of the segment were listed. The final equal probability sample of housing units for the 1990 NES was systematically selected from the housing unit listings for the sampled area segments.

The overall probability of selection for 1990 NES households was $f=.00003761$ or $.3761$ in 10,000. The equal probability sample of households was achieved by using the standard multi-stage sampling technique of setting the sampling rate for selecting housing units within area segments to be inversely proportional to the PPS probabilities (see above) used to select the PSU and area segment.

Fourth Stage Respondent Selection

Within each sampled housing unit, the SRC interviewer prepared a complete listing of all eligible household members. Using an objective procedure described by Kish[3] (1949), a single respondent was then selected at random to be interviewed. Regardless of circumstances, no substitutions were permitted for the designated respondent.

SAMPLE DESIGN SPECIFICATIONS

The targeted minimum completed interview sample size for the 1990 NES Post-Election Survey was $n=1,750$ cases. In the original sample size computation, the following assumptions were made: response rate = $.68$, combined occupancy/eligibility rate = $.83$. These assumptions were derived from survey experience in the 1986 NES Post Election Survey. Table 4 provides a full description of the original sample design specifications.

[3] L. Kish, "A Procedure for Objective Respondent Selection Within the Household" JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN STATISTICAL ASSOCIATION 44 (1949): 380-387.

Table 4

1990 NATIONAL POST-ELECTION SURVEY
ORIGINAL SAMPLE DESIGN SPECIFICATIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS
AND ACTUAL SAMPLE DESIGN OUTCOMES

	Original Specifications and Assumptions	Actual Outcome
Completed interviews	1,750	2,004
Response Rate	.68	.714
Eligible sample households	2,573	2,808
Occupancy/Eligibility Rate*	.87	.802
Final sample HU listings	3,256	3,503
Sample growth from update**	1.05	1.068
Sample listings from frame	3,100	3,280

* Expected eligibility (.97) x occupancy (.90)

** Since the updating process produces about a 5% increase in sample lines over the count selected from the National Sample system, the update inflation factor was set at 1.05.

SAMPLE DESIGN OUTCOMES

In comparing the design stage expectations in the first column of Table 4 with the actual survey outcomes in the second column, it can be seen that the sample growth from the update procedure was slightly higher than expected. Also, the original sample design specifications overestimated the occupancy/eligibility rates and underestimated the response rate for the actual survey. Design stage assumptions for the study response rate and occupancy/eligibility rate were based on the rates obtained in the 1986 Post-Election Survey.

The actual occupancy/eligibility rate for the 1990 NES Post-

Election Survey (.802) was somewhat lower than the rate obtained in the 1986 NES Post-Election Survey (.835). The response rate for 1990 (.714) was higher than the 1986 NES Post-Election Survey response rate of .677 or the 1988 NES Pre-election response rate of .705.

The original area probability sample for the 1990 NES was selected as a basic sample replicate of 3280 sample HU listings. In the Post-Election surveys the elapsed time between Election Day and the date of interview is a critical design consideration. Since timing is so critical, the option of using a replicated sample approach to control final study sample size has little utility. In order to ensure that no fewer than a minimum of 1750 completed interviews would be obtained within the study time frame, the initial size of the basic sample replicate was increased from the expected 3100 to 3280 listings (approximately a 5% increase). In addition, 6.8% sample growth from SRC's standard sample update procedure increased the size of the final sample to n=3503 housing units listings. Due to the deliberate increase in sample size and higher than expected response rate, the final number of completed interviews (n=2004) was approximately 14.5% higher than the minimum interview target specified for the survey.

WEIGHTED ANALYSIS OF 1990 NES DATA

The area probability sample design for the 1990 NES results in an equal probability sample of U.S. households. However, within sample households a single adult respondent is chosen at random to be interviewed. Since the number of eligible adults may vary from one household to another, the random selection of a single adult introduces inequality into respondents' selection probabilities. In analysis, a respondent selection weight should be used to compensate for these unequal selection probabilities. The value of the respondent selection weight is exactly equal to the number of eligible adults in the household from which the random respondent was selected. The use of the respondent selection weight is strongly encouraged, despite past evaluations that have shown these weights to have little significant impact on the values of NES estimates of descriptive statistics.

The current policy of the National Election Studies is not to include in public use data sets special analysis weights designed to compensate for nonresponse or to post-stratify the sample to known population distribution controls. Analysts interested in developing their own nonresponse or post-stratification adjustment factors must request access to the necessary sample control data from the NES Board.

SAMPLING ERRORS OF 1990 NES ESTIMATES

Sampling Error Calculation Programs

The probability sample design for the 1990 National Election Study permits the calculation of estimates of sampling error for survey statistics. For calculating sampling errors of statistics from complex sample surveys, the OSIRIS

statistical analysis and data management software system offers the PSALMS and REPERR programs. PSALMS is a general purpose sampling error program that incorporates the Taylor Series approximation approach to the estimation of variances of ratios (including means, scale variables, indices, proportions) and their differences. REPERR is an OSIRIS program that incorporates algorithms for replicated approaches to variance estimation. Both Balanced Repeated Replication (BRR) and Jackknife Repeated Replication (JRR) are available as program options. The current version of REPERR is best suited for estimating sampling errors and design effects for regression and correlation statistics.

Sampling Error Codes and Calculation Model

Estimation of variances for complex sample survey estimates requires a computation model. Individual data records must be assigned sampling error codes that reflect the complex structure of the sample and are compatible with the computation algorithms of the various programs. The sampling error codes for the 1990 NES are included as a variable in the ICPSR Public Use data set. The assigned sampling error codes are designed to facilitate sampling error computation according to a paired selection model for both Taylor Series approximation and Replication method programs.

Table 5 provides a description of how individual sampling error code values are to be paired for sampling error computations. Thirty (30) pairs or strata of sampling error computation units (SECU's) are defined. Each SECU in a stratum pair includes cases assigned to a single sampling error code value. The exceptions are the second SECU in stratum 27 that is comprised of cases assigned sampling code values 36 and 55 and the second SECU in stratum 29 that is comprised of cases with SECU's 61 and 63.

Table 5

1990 NES POST-ELECTION SURVEY PAIRED SELECTION MODEL FOR SAMPLING ERROR COMPUTATIONS

Pair (Stratum)	(SECU) 1 of 2 Codes	(SECU) 2 of 2 Codes
1	103	104
2	105	106
3	99	100
4	101	102
5	95	96
6	97	98
7	93	94
8	91	92
9	89	90
10	83	84
11	81	82

12	77	78
13	75	76
14	73	74
15	2	6
16	7	8
17	14	16
18	17	18
19	19	21
20	24	28
21	63	65
22	30	33
23	37	43
24	40	48
25	42	45
26	50	51
27	52	36 + 55
28	57	64
29	60	61 + 63
30	67	68

Generalized Sampling Error Results for the 1990 NES
 To assist NES data analysts, the OSIRIS PSALMS program was used to compute sampling errors for a wide-ranging set of means and proportions estimated from NES survey data sets. For each estimate, sampling errors were computed for the total sample and for fifteen demographic and political affiliation subclasses of NES samples. The results of these sampling error computations were then summarized and translated into the general usage sampling error table provided in Table 6.

Incorporating the pattern of "design effects" observed in the extensive set of example computations, Table 6 provides approximate standard errors for percentage estimates based on the 1990 NES. To use the table, examine the column heading to find the percentage value that best approximates the value of the estimated percentage that is of interest.[4] Next, locate the approximate sample size base (denominator for the proportion) in the left-hand row margin of the table. To find the approximate standard error of a percentage estimate, simply cross-reference the appropriate column (percentage) and row (sample size base). Note: the tabulated values represent approximately one standard error for the percentage estimate. To construct an approximate confidence interval, the analyst should apply the appropriate critical point from the "z" distribution (e.g. $z=1.96$ for a two-sided 95% confidence interval half-width). Furthermore, the approximate standard errors in the table apply only to single point estimates of percentages, not to the difference between two percentage estimates.

The generalized variance results presented in Table 6 are a useful tool for initial, cursory examination of the NES survey results. For more in-depth analysis and reporting of critical estimates, analysts are encouraged to compute exact estimates of standard errors using the appropriate choice of a sampling error program and computation model.

[4] The standard error of a percentage is a symmetric function with its maximum centered at $p=50\%$; i.e., the standards errors of $p=40\%$ and $p=60\%$ estimates are equal.

Table 6

1990 NES POST-ELECTION SURVEY
GENERALIZED VARIANCE TABLE
APPROXIMATE STANDARD ERRORS FOR PERCENTAGES

For percentage estimates near

Sample n	50%	40% or 60%	30% or 70%	20% or 80%	10% or 90%
----------	-----	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------

The approximate standard error of the percentage is:

100	5.385	5.277	4.933	4.308	3.231
200	3.912	3.824	3.581	3.128	2.343
300	3.278	3.210	3.006	2.260	1.962
400	2.905	2.846	2.661	2.324	1.743
500	2.663	2.603	2.437	2.128	1.593
750	2.294	2.244	2.094	1.830	1.379
1000	2.078	2.039	1.907	1.657	1.250
1500	1.846	1.803	1.688	1.474	1.102
2000	1.722	1.691	1.568	1.368	1.030

□>> 1990 VOTE VALIDATION AND ELECTION ADMINISTRATION SURVEY DATA

The Vote Validation study was conducted by the National Election Studies in July of 1991 on respondents to the 1990 National Election Study (NES). The vote validation process basically involves sending name and address information for respondents who say they are registered to vote, to a Survey Research Center (SRC) field interviewer. She is instructed to check with the local office at which respondents report being registered for the purpose of locating the registration records of these respondents and ascertaining whether or not the records show that the respondents voted

in the most recent general election. This is the eighth time that NES has done a voter validation study. Previous validations were done for the 1964, 1976, 1978, 1980, 1984, 1986, and 1988 Post Election Studies.

A. The Election Administration Survey Variables

In order to conduct elections honestly, lists of eligible voters are generated by each election office, with each voter assigned to one and only one precinct. Therefore, for the purpose of registration and voting, an individual must be associated with one and only one address, belonging in one and only one electoral jurisdiction.

Since NES respondents come from a national area probability sample, a large number of different election offices are included in the validation study, usually over 100. The jurisdiction of these election offices is usually the county but in New England and a few other states, registration and voting records are maintained at a local level, including townships.

Because of the diversity in record keeping and access across these many offices, the vote validation data has two conceptual parts. The most obvious part is the result of the record check for individual respondents. The other part may perhaps be labeled "contextual" data, for these variables describe the search procedure and the records themselves.

Variables describing the records and the search procedure are included because the relationship between the respondent's report and what is found or not found in official records is not necessarily a straightforward one. One view of the matching process is that the official records are always correct, and that in the event of discrepancy, the respondent must have "misreported" his or her behavior. Another view is that the records themselves are but another form of measurement of a particular behavior, and as such, are subject to measurement error. So, for example, the computerized transcription of poll records, which are the records that have been checked in most offices, could be inaccurate. The situation is made more complex by the fact that there appears to be an irreducible minimum proportion of respondents for whom a record of registration cannot be located at all, and logically, it is difficult if not impossible to say that this negative finding demonstrates beyond doubt that respondents are NOT registered. It is always possible that with a "better" search, a more accurate spelling of the person's name, a correct understanding of where the person is actually registered, the record would have been located.

It is important to note also that the search is conducted by human beings, specifically by SRC interviewers, who are trained in survey methods but not in records management, and who may themselves vary in terms of their understanding of the records, their pertinacity, the thoroughness by which every avenue in the records is explored, and so on. In an attempt to understand the role of the interviewer herself in

this process, NES RE-validated the 1988 respondents as part of the 1991 vote validation study. The notion was that if there are interviewer effects, these would show up as different interviewers conduct record checks on the same people in the same offices. The re-validation of 1988 respondents will be released in a separate study, but the 1988 vote information was gathered for 1990 respondents as well, and is included in this dataset.

In summary, it seemed imperative to give the user information not only about WHAT was found, but what the records themselves and the search was like, so that the user can make some evaluation of whether record-respondent discrepancies cluster in particular patterns of record keeping or search.[5]

Information about the records, and the search process, was coded from several sources. First, the SRC interviewer who

[5] This view has been evolving within NES for some period of time. The following technical reports, papers, and other memoranda trace this development: Traugott, S. (1989) "Validating Self-Reported Vote, 1964-1988"; Presser, S., S. Traugott, and M. Traugott (1990), "Vote 'Over' Reporting in Surveys: The Records or the Respondents"; Presser, S., M. Traugott, and S. Traugott (1991), "Extending Methodological Development of Survey Response Errors for Voting"; and Traugott, S. and G. Morchio (1991), "1990 Vote Validation." Any of these papers or reports are available by contacting NES project staff.

did the records check administered a brief (10-15 minute) questionnaire to an official in the records office asking specifically about how the records were organized. The purpose of this interaction was for the interviewer to gain information to enable her to conduct the records search efficiently.

Second, as the interviewer went on to fill out the forms recording the results of individual record checks, that is, to actually use the records that had been described, her understanding of the records often changed, sometimes by the discovery of additional sources not originally described to her. These discoveries were annotated on the forms themselves, rather than on the office interview. The NES staff reviewed all of the individual record check forms from a particular office in conjunction with the election official's questionnaire.

A third source of information, used somewhat tentatively because of the possibility of change in the intervening time, was the previous interviews conducted in the same office. (NES has been in the same sample frame since 1984, and many of these offices have been visited three previous times.) These interviews were used to elucidate points that were not clear. Finally, for between 20-30% of the offices,

various points remained unclear and the offices and/or the SRC interviewers were called by the NES staff for further information.

All of these sources were used in the coding of the election office variables (900757-900803). The chief focus of the office variables is in what sources were actually used by the interviewer, and how they were used. The data do not describe in detail all of the records that the office keeps. These election administration variables differ in focus from previous codings of office variables, where the interest was in describing the office records themselves, rather than those used. The reason for this is that as staff read through the materials, they were struck by how frequently sources that were theoretically available were not used because they were not readily accessible. For example, the office might have a computerized system for keeping track of registrants. But, it is in another building, and interviewers don't have access to it on anything but printouts. Or, the computer is "down." Often, poll books are stored off-site, and offices are reluctant to retrieve them for inspection, claiming that "everything on them is on the computer." Hence, while the office interview schedule itself is attached as part of the documentation, the user should be aware that the office variables are not a direct transcription from this questionnaire, but rather address the somewhat different question of what sources were actually used.

B. Preparation of the Record Check Forms for each Respondent

Coversheets are prepared for each respondent who is to be "validated" and one individual record check form is filled out for each coversheet sent to the field. Coversheets are assigned to particular offices. Starting with the validation study conducted in 1984, NES has attempted to locate the registration record only for those respondents who tell staff that they are registered. In thinking about locating those who do claim to be registered, staff know that people are registered at one and, in theory, only one locality, under a specific name.[6]

Therefore, staff need to know exactly where a person is registered, and to have a "good-enough" spelling of the person's name so that they can be located. When a registration record can't be found for a person, the conclusion that therefore they are not registered is difficult to defend against the proposition that the respondent is not findable because staff do not have the correct NAME for the respondent or that the respondent is for some reason registered in a different locality than where h/she was interviewed.

The best way, perhaps the only way, to defend against this threat to the external validity of the record check, is to reduce the number of persons claiming to be registered for whom staff cannot find a record. That in turn has come to mean in practice: a) questions on the interview schedule about exactly where a person is registered and where h/her

polling place is; b) intensive review by staff of this information plus recontact information and of the spelling of a person's name as it was entered when the coversheet was originally logged in; and c) preparation of "coversheets" for each respondent that also include information about whether the person has recently changed their name, has a listed telephone number, family composition and residential mobility. (Interviewers are NOT told whether or not the

[6] A few respondents told interviewers that they were registered, but were very vague about exactly where, e.g., "in upstate New York where I used to live." No attempt was made to locate records for such respondents. In a few other cases, the interviewers misunderstood instructions about which offices they were to contact to validate the respondent. These cases are treated as "non-validated."

respondent reported voting.) [7]

C. Special Problems in Assignment of Respondents to Offices

For a variety of reasons, 5-10% of those saying that they are registered to vote also tell staff that they are not registered in the jurisdiction in which they were interviewed. In our mobile society, it sometimes takes a while for registration address to catch up with actual living address. Or, as in the case of college students or live-in domestic help, people may have a different perception of where they actually live, where their home is, than is contemplated in the rules of sample selection (does this person spend most nights in a week at this address, etc., etc.) Some people are registered in counties that do not fall in our sample. Appropriate offices for these individuals were identified and the respondent's record check was conducted by an SRC field interviewer calling that office. Usually but not always, the offices so contacted were cooperative, but the user should be aware that this form of checking is necessarily less thorough than that done in person in an election office in which an interview has been conducted. A code of "999" in variable Variable 900714 indicates that the record check was conducted over the telephone.

Occasionally, staff sent out a record check form to more than one office for a single individual, when it was difficult to tell in which locale a person was most likely to be registered. If this happened, the differences between the forms were reconciled so that the data contain only one validation record per respondent.

D. The Lookup Process

If election offices share a common central mission, that of conducting elections without fraud, they also display a

bewildering variety of terms for similar procedures, to say nothing of widely different procedures to achieve the same ends. There are places with numerous versions of sophisticated computer tracking, and places with one set of poll ledgers. The supervisors of these offices can be

[7] In 1990, staff actually sent out records for respondents who had not given their names but who had indicated that they were registered. In many cases, it was possible to find someone of matching age and gender living at the same address at which the respondent was interviewed. If no such match was made, however, the person's validation data was treated as "missing."

highly professional, or, in one or two cases, obvious political appointees. Some offices boast the latest in computer technology, including digitized signatures and bar codes over which a wand can be passed to register that a person has voted; while others make do with signatures and initials on the original registration card. We have validated in jurisdictions having voters numbering in the millions and thousands of precincts and in places where there is one precinct with several hundred registrants.

Each year staff face the difficulty of trying to train survey interviewers how to diagnose the intricacies of records management in the offices they are likely to encounter, so that they can efficiently use ALL the sources potentially available to them in the actual lookup process. In 1984, staff hit upon the strategy of conducting an interview with an election official, prior to actually looking up the records, so that the look-up person would have a detailed idea of what records were available to her. Each time this is done, staff struggle to improve the office questionnaire so that it will better lead the naive interviewer through the maze of different office procedures.

Although NES staff is somewhat removed from the complexities of each individual office, they try to write some general instructions to guide the interviewers in the lookup process. For this study, the task of the interviewer was described to them as first FINDING a record that they were reasonably sure was the respondent's; then, ascertaining what the record showed about whether the respondent voted or did not vote in the general elections of 1990 and 1988. It was explained that all offices maintain a list of who is registered in their jurisdiction. From this master list, all offices send to each polling place a list in some form of who is eligible to vote at that voting place. When people vote, some mark is made to indicate that they have done so (to reduce the possibility of fraud, following the time honored rule of one person, one vote.) Information about whether a person did or did not vote may or may not be posted back to the master office list of who is registered. There are many variations on this schemata; for example,

some offices divide the master list (which is on cards) into precinct binders and send these out to the polls where they are marked.) Thus, the master list is also the poll book. The general outline, however, is simple.

Based on this general outline, and assuming that most offices post vote information back to the registration record, interviewers were to look first at the master registration record for evidence that R had voted. If the record did not show that R voted, they were to look at the original poll books, to the extent they were available, for some further indication of vote. (Historiographers will recognize the distinction between primary and secondary sources, one that has been slow to dawn on staff as survey researchers.) One example will illustrate the importance of primary sources. An interviewer happened to be a registered voter in a county where she was looking up 1990 respondents. She noted that many more respondents appeared to have voted in 1990 than in 1988. She thought this was strange. Accordingly, she looked up her own record for 1988, and found that the computer did not show her as voting, although she had. It didn't show her son or husband as voting either, although they voted with her. The original poll records, however, showed she and her family as voting. It turned out that there had been a sizeable transcription error in this office in 1988.

As the NES staff evaluated what was received back from interviewers, both record check forms and election official interviews, it was clear that in many offices original sources were not used, either because they were not made available to the interviewer (sometimes they are destroyed after information has been posted to the computer) or because the interviewer did not press for access to these sources. Also, some interviewers went about their task in a way exactly contrary to instructions, i.e., they looked first at the poll records, and then searched the registration records for people they couldn't locate. The trouble with this strategy is that some nontrivial proportion of people are not registered to vote in the precinct in which they were interviewed; rather they vote somewhere else in the same jurisdiction. Starting with the poll books means considerably more going back and forth between registration records and poll records; in this process, it is much more difficult for the interviewer with a sizeable number of cases in an office to keep track of exactly which sources she has or has not used in a particular case.[8]

The post-fieldwork staff evaluation process was extremely time-consuming and inefficient. When NES next undertakes

[8] In fairness to the interviewers, it should be said that they are entirely dependent on the good will of the people assisting them in any given office. Often, these people had an understandable interest in minimizing the time devoted to helping the interviewers and the interviewers were reluctant to press them with time-consuming requests

for original sources. In retrospect, the NES staff needed to do much more to prepare the offices and the interviewers regarding resources needed to complete the lookup task.

voter validation, hopefully in 1993, they are convinced that the process of training interviewers to work in specific offices will have to be significantly revised, building both on the knowledge gained over the last several vote validations of the way in which registration records are managed and with the assistance of records management specialists. As staff come closer to the real possibility of a 1992 vote validation study, they intend also, to the extent that the budget permits, to seek advice from a planning committee consisting of scholars interested in this topic.

E. Contents of the Data

Records for 1990 respondents who were not validated have been "padded" with missing data codes.

The data contain variables from several sources. These are:

1. Variables from the individual record check form filled out by the interviewer in the election office. (Variables 900712-900755)
2. Summary variables combining self-report and the result of the record check. (Variable 900756)
3. Variables describing the sources used and the search procedure in the election records office in which the respondent's record was looked up. (Variables 900757-900803).

F. Vote Validation Study Staff

Santa Traugott	NES Project Manager
Giovanna Morchio	Study Manager, NES
Fran Eliot	Research Assistant, NES
Heather Hewett	Study Manager, SRC/Field Section

□

>> 1990 NES STAFF AND TECHNICAL PAPERS

Brehm, John. (1985a) "Report on Coding of Economic Conditions Series in the 1984 Pre-Post Election Study: A Report to the Board of Overseers, National Election Studies." Working Paper No. 8. Ann Arbor: CPS, June 1985.

Brehm, John. (1985b) "Analysis of Result Code Disposition for Continuous Monitoring by Time in Field: Report to the Board of Overseers, National Election Studies." Working

- Paper No. 7. Ann Arbor: CPS, August 1985.
- Brehm, John. (1985c) "Question Ordering Effects on Reported Vote Choice." Unpublished Memo, July 1985.
- Brehm, John. (1987a) "How Representative is the 1986 Post-election Survey?" Memo to Board of Overseers, National Election Studies, May 1987.
- Brehm, John. (1987b) "Who's Missing? an Analysis of NonResponse in the 1986 Election Study: A Report to the Board of Overseers, National Election Studies." Working Paper No. 10. Ann Arbor: CPS, December 1987.
- Brehm, John and Santa Traugott. (1986) "Similarity and Representativeness of the 1985 Pilot Half-samples." Memo to the NES 1985 Pilot Study Committee March, 1986.
- Lake, Celinda. (1983a) "Similarity and Representativeness of 1983 Pilot Samples." Memo to National Election Studies 1984 Planning Committee, September 1983.
- Lake, Celinda. (1983b) "Comparison of 3-point, 5-point, and 7-point Scales from the CATI Experiment 1982 Election Study." Memo to NES Board of Overseers, November 1983.
- Lake, Celinda. (1984) "Coding of Independent/Independents and Apoliticals in the Party Identification Summary Code and Apoliticals in the Rolling Cross-Section." Memo to Board of Overseers, National Election Studies. February 1984.
- Morchio, Giovanna. (1987) "Trends in NES Response Rates." Memo to NES Board of Overseers.
- Morchio, Giovanna and Maria Sanchez. (1984) "Creation of a Filter Variable to be Used When Analyzing Questions about Congressional Candidates in the 1982 Integrated Personal/ISR CATI/Berkeley CATI Dataset: A Report to the Board of Overseers, National Election Studies." Working Paper No. 1, Ann Arbor: CPS, February 1984.
- Morchio, Giovanna and Maria Sanchez. (1984) "Comparison of the Michigan Method of District Assignment on the Telephone with the Personal Interview Simulated Data: A Report to the Board of Overseers, National Election Studies." Working Paper No. 2. Ann Arbor: CPS, March 1984.
- Morchio, Giovanna, Maria Sanchez and Santa Traugott. (1985) "Mode Differences: DK Responses in the 1984 Post-Election Survey: A Report to the Board of Overseers, National Election Studies." Working Paper No. 9. Ann Arbor: CPS, November 1985.
- Morchio, Giovanna and Santa Traugott. (1986) "Congressional District Assignment in an RDD Sample: Results of 1982 CATI Experiment." Memo to the 1986 Pilot Planning Committee. February 1986.

- NES Staff. (1984) "Questions and Versions in NES Continuous Monitoring, 1984: A Report to the Board of Overseers, National Election Studies." Working Paper No. 3. Ann Arbor: CPS, August 1984.
- NES Staff. (1984) "Weekly Field Report for the National Election Studies Continuous Monitoring, Jan. 11-Aug. 3, 1984: A Report to the Board of Overseers, National Election Studies." Working Paper No. 4. Ann Arbor: CPS, August 1984.
- NES Staff. (1985) "Progress of the Rolling Cross Section." Memo to NES Board of Overseers, February 1985.
- NES Staff. (undated) "Years of Schooling." Unpublished Staff Memo.
- NES Staff. (undated) "Newspaper Code." Unpublished Staff Memo.
- Traugott, Santa. (1984) "Two Versions of the Abortion Question." Unpublished Staff Memo to the NES Board of Overseers, June 1984.
- Traugott, Santa. (1985) "Sample Weighting in NES Continuous Monitoring, 1984.: A Report to the Board of Overseers, National Election Studies," Working Paper No. 5. Ann Arbor: CPS, April 1985.
- Traugott, Santa. (1985) "Sample Weighting in NES Pre-Post Election Survey, 1984: A Report to the Board of Overseers, National Election Studies," Working Paper No. 6. Ann Arbor: CPS, April 1985.
- Traugott, Santa. (1985) "Assessment of Media Measures in RXS." Unpublished Staff Memo, July 1985.
- Traugott, Santa. (1985) "Assessment of Media Measures in Pre-Post" Unpublished Staff Memo, July 1985.
- Traugott, Santa. (undated) "The Political Interest Variable on the 1984 Election Study." Unpublished Staff Memo to NES Planning Committee.
- Traugott, Santa. (1985) "Some Analysis of Hard-to-Reach Rolling Thunder Respondents." Unpublished Staff Memo to NES Board of Overseers, February 1985. □>> 1990 LIST OF PILOT STUDY REPO
- Abelson, Robert. Message on Vote Validation Experiment.
- Calvo, Maria Antonia and Steven J. Rosenstone. The Re-Framing of the Abortion Debate.
- Kinder, Donald R. and Thomas Nelson. Experimental Investigations of Opinion Frames and Survey Responses: A Report to the NES Board.
- Knight, Kathleen. Comparisons of Liberal-Conservative Items in the ANES 1989 Pilot Study.

Krosnick, Jon and Matthew K. Berent. Impact of Verbal Labeling on Response Alternatives and Branching on Attitude Measurement Reliability.

Leege, David, Ken Wald and Lyman Kellstedt. Religion and Politics. A Report on Measures of Religiosity in the 1989 NES Pilot Study.

Markus, Gregory. Measuring Popular Individualism.

NES Staff. Possible Bias due to Attrition and Sample Selection in the 1989 Pilot Study.

Price, Vincent and John Zaller. Evaluation of Media Exposure Items in 1989.
 Appendix 1: [Price & Zaller] Measuring individual differences...
 Appendix 2: [Zaller & Price] In One Ear and Out the Other...

Rosenstone, Steven J. and Gregory A. Diamond. Measuring Public Opinion on Political issues.

Traugott, Michael. Memo to Pilot Study Committee, including as an Appendix: Understanding Campaign Effects on Candidate Recall and Recognition.

Zaller, John. Experimental Tests of the Question Answering Model of the Mass Survey Response.

□>> 1990 CODEBOOK INFORMATION

The following example from the 1948 NES study provides the standard format for codebook variable documentation.

Note that NES studies which are not part of the Time-Series usually omit marginals and the descriptive content in lines 2-5 (except for variable name).

Line

```

1  =====
2  VAR 480026    NAME-R NOT VT-WAS R REG TO VT
3                COLUMNS 61    - 61
4                NUMERIC
5                MD=0 OR GE 8
6
7                Q. 17.  (IF R DID NOT VOTE)  WERE YOU REGISTERED (ELIGIBLE)
8                TO VOTE.
9                .....
10
11             82          1.  YES
12             149         2.  NO
13

```

```

14          0          8.  DK
15          9          9.  NA
16        422          0.  INAP., R VOTED

```

Line 2 - VARIABLE NAME. Note that in the codebook the variable name (usually a 'number') does not include the "V" prefix which is used in the release SAS and SPSS data definition files (.sas and .sps files) for all variables including those which do not have 'number' names. For example the variable "VERSION" in the codebook is "VVERSION" in the data definition files.

Line 2 - "NAME". This is the variable label used in the SAS and SPSS data definition files (.sas and .sps files). Some codebooks exclude this.

Line 3 - COLUMNS. Columns in the ASCII data file (.dat file).

Line 4 - CHARACTER OR NUMERIC. If numeric and the variable is a decimal rather than integer variable, the number of decimal places is also indicated (e.g. "NUMERIC DEC 4")

Line 5 - Values which are assigned to missing by default in the Study's SAS and and SPSS data definition files (.sas and .sps files).

Line 7 - Actual question text for survey variables or a description of non-survey variables (for example, congressional district). Survey items usually include the question number (for example "B1a.") from the Study questionnaire; beginning in 1996 non-survey items also have unique item numbers (for example "CSheet.1").

Line 9 - A dashed or dotted line usually separates question text from any other documentation which follows.

Line 10- When present, annotation provided by Study staff is presented below the question text/description and preceding code values.

Lines 11-16

Code values are listed with descriptive labels. Valid codes (those not having 'missing' status in line 5) are presented first, followed by the values described in line 5. For continuous variables, one line may appear providing the range of possible values. A blank line usually separates the 'valid' and 'missing' values.

Lines 11-16

Marginals are usually provided for discrete variables. The counts may be unweighted or weighted; check the Study codebook introductory text to determine weight usage.

□

>> 1990 ICPSR PROCESSING INFORMATION

The data collection was processed according to standard ICPSR processing procedures. The data were checked for illegal or inconsistent code values which, when found, were corrected or recoded to missing data values. Consistency checks were performed. Statements bracketed in "<" and ">"

signs in the body of the codebook were added by the processors for explanatory purposes.

□>> 1990 VARIABLE DESCRIPTION LIST

VARIABLE	VARIABLE LABEL
-----	-----

VERSION	NES VERSION NUMBER
DSETNO	NES DATASET NUMBER
900001	ICPSR ARCHIVE NUMBER
.....	...there are no variables 900002,900003
900004	Respondent Post-Election Case ID

SAMPLING INFORMATION

900005	Primary Area Code
900006	Primary Area Name
900007	Segment Number
900008	Census Region
900009	Postal State Abbreviation and Congressional District Number
900010	FIPS State Code
900011	FIPS State and County Code
900012	ICPSR State Code
900013	Congressional District
900014	ICPSR State and Congressional District Code
900015	Tract/Enumerated District Indicator
900016	1980 Census Tract
900017	1980 Census Enumeration District
900018	1980 Census Place Code
900019	FIPS 1980 SMSA Code
900020	FIPS 1980 SCSA Code
900021	Size of Place of Interview
900022	Actual Population of Place of Interview
900023	1980 Belt Code
900024	1980 Minor Civil Division
900025	Sampling Error Code
900026	Selection Table
900027	Selected R Person Number

HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

900028	Number of persons in household
900029	Number of eligible adults
900030	Number of children under six years old
900031	Number of children six to nine years old
900032	Number of children ten to thirteen years old
900033	Number of children fourteen to seventeen years old
900034	Household composition

INTERVIEW/ER INFORMATION

900035 Refusal conversion indicator
900036 Persuasion letter requested
900037 Final call number
900038 Final result code
900039 Was respondent's name obtained
900040 If R is female, has R legally changed her name
900041 Phone number obtained
900042 Should not interview by telephone?
900043 Interviewer's ID number
900044 Interviewer's race
900045 Interviewer's languages
900046 Interviewer's ethnicity
900047 Interviewer's age, bracketed
900048 Interviewer's years of work, bracketed
900049 Interviewer's gender
900050 Interviewer's education, bracketed
900051 Interviewer's interview number
900052 Date of interview - month
900053 Date of interview - day
900054 Total length of interview
900055 Total time to pre-edit
900056 Total time to post-interview edit
900057 Beginning time - local

900058 Type of Congressional race (House of Representatives)
900059 Type of Senate race
900060 Type of Governor race
900061 Form type

R'S INTEREST/ATTENTION TO CAMPAIGN/MEDIA

900062 R's interest in the campaign
900063 Did R read about the campaign in any newspapers
900064 How much attention did R give to the campaign in the newspaper
900065 Did R watch any programs about the campaign on TV
900066 How many programs about the campaign did R watch
900067 How much attention did R give to the campaign news on TV
900068 Does R ever discuss politics
900069 How often does R discuss politics
900070 How often did R discuss politics in the past week
900071 How often did R read a daily newspaper in the past week
900072 How many days did R watch TV news in the past week

900073 Interviewer Checkpoint: Form Type

WHAT R LIKES/DISLIKES ABOUT DEMOCRATIC PARTY

900074 Whether R likes anything about the democratic party
900075 What R likes about the Democratic party - first mention
900076 What R likes about the Democratic party - second mention
900077 What R likes about the Democratic party - third mention
900078 What R likes about the Democratic party - fourth mention
900079 What R likes about the Democratic party - fifth mention

900080 Whether R dislikes anything about the Democratic party
 900081 What R dislikes about the Democratic party - first
 mention
 900082 What R dislikes about the Democratic party - second
 mention
 900083 What R dislikes about the Democratic party - third
 mention
 900084 What R dislikes about the Democratic party - fourth
 mention
 900085 What R dislikes about the Democratic party - fifth
 mention

WHAT R LIKES/DISLIKES ABOUT REPUBLICAN PARTY

900086 Whether R likes anything about the Republican party
 900087 What R likes about the Republican party - first mention
 900088 What R likes about the Republican party - second mention
 900089 What R likes about the Republican party - third mention
 900090 What R likes about the Republican party - fourth mention
 900091 What R likes about the Republican party - fifth mention
 900092 Whether R dislikes anything about the Republican party
 900093 What R dislikes about the Republican party - first
 mention
 900094 What R dislikes about the Republican party - second
 mention
 900095 What R dislikes about the Republican party - third
 mention
 900096 What R dislikes about the Republican party - fourth
 mention
 900097 What R dislikes about the Republican party - fifth
 mention

R'S ASSESSMENT OF BUSH PRESIDENCY

900098 R approve/disapprove of Bush's handling of presidency
 900099 Strength of R's approval/disapproval of Bush's handling
 of presidency
 900100 R approve/disapprove of Bush's handling of economy
 900101 Strength of R's approval/disapproval of Bush's handling
 of economy
 900102 R approve/disapprove of Bush's handling of relations
 with foreign countries
 900103 Strength of R's approval/disapproval of Bush's handling
 of relations with foreign countries
 900104 R approve/disapprove of Bush's handling of pollution
 and other environmental problems
 900105 Strength of R's approval/disapproval of Bush's handling
 of pollution and other environmental problems

CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGN

900106 How much did R personally care about the outcome of
 the U.S. congressional election
 900107 Does R remember the congressional candidates
 900108 Number of congressional candidate - candidate 1
 900109 From which party was the candidate - candidate 1
 900110 Collapsed code for congressional candidate - candidate 1

900111 R's knowledge of candidate's name and party -
 candidate 1
 900112 Number of congressional candidate - candidate 2
 900113 From which party was the candidate - candidate 2
 900114 Collapsed code for congressional candidate -
 candidate 2
 900115 R's knowledge of candidate's name and party -
 candidate 2
 900116 Number of congressional candidate - candidate 3
 900117 From which party was the candidate - candidate 3
 900118 Collapsed code for congressional candidate -
 candidate 3
 900119 R's knowledge of candidate's name and party -
 candidate 3

 900120 Interviewer Checkpoint: U.S. Senate race in state?

SENATE CAMPAIGN

900121 Does R remember the Senate candidates
 900122 Number of Senate candidate - candidate 1
 900123 From which party was the candidate - candidate 1
 900124 Collapsed code for Senate candidate - candidate 1
 900125 R's knowledge of candidate's name and party -
 candidate 1
 900126 Number of Senate candidate - candidate 2
 900127 From which party was the candidate - candidate 2
 900128 Collapsed code for Senate candidate - candidate 2
 900129 R's knowledge of candidate's name and party -
 candidate 2
 900130 Number of Senate candidate - candidate 3
 900131 From which party was the candidate - candidate 3
 900132 Collapsed code for Senate candidate - candidate 3
 900133 R's knowledge of candidate's name and party -
 candidate 3

FEELING THERMOMETER: POLITICAL FIGURES

900134 Feeling thermometer - George Bush
 900135 Feeling thermometer - Mario Cuomo
 900136 Feeling thermometer - Mikhail Gorbachev
 900137 Feeling thermometer - Dan Quayle
 900138 Feeling thermometer - Ronald Reagan
 900139 Feeling thermometer - Jesse Jackson
 900140 Feeling thermometer - Democratic U.S. Senate candidate
 900141 Feeling thermometer - Republican U.S. Senate candidate
 900142 Feeling thermometer - U.S. Senate incumbent whose
 term is not up - race in state
 900143 Feeling thermometer - U.S. Senate incumbent - no race
 in state
 900144 Feeling thermometer - second U.S. Senate incumbent -
 no race in state
 900145 Feeling thermometer - Democratic U.S. House candidate
 900146 Feeling thermometer - Republican U.S. House candidate
 900147 Feeling thermometer - Democratic gubernatorial candidate
 900148 Feeling thermometer - Republican gubernatorial candidate
 900149 Feeling thermometer - Governor or retiring Governor -
 no race in state

900150 Feeling thermometer - third party gubernatorial
candidate (Connecticut only)
900151 Feeling thermometer - Democratic party
900152 Feeling thermometer - Republican party
900153 Feeling thermometer - political parties in general

FEELING THERMOMETER: GROUPS IN SOCIETY

900154 Feeling thermometer - supporters of abortion
900155 Feeling thermometer - Blacks
900156 Feeling thermometer - conservatives
900157 Feeling thermometer - labor unions
900158 Feeling thermometer - the women's movement
900159 Feeling thermometer - people on welfare
900160 Feeling thermometer - people seeking to protect the
environment
900161 Feeling thermometer - liberals
900162 Feeling thermometer - poor people
900163 Feeling thermometer - opponents of abortion

R'S ASSESSMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL PERFORMANCE

900164 Does R approve/disapprove of the way Congress has been
handling its job
900165 How strongly does R approve/disapprove of Congress'
handling of its job

R'S VOTE: 1988

900166 Did R vote in 1988 election
900167 Who did R vote for in 1988 presidential election

PROBE INDICATORS

900168 Was question B13a probed by interviewer
900169 Was question B13b probed by interviewer
900170 Was question B13c probed by interviewer
900171 Was question B13d probed by interviewer
900172 Was question B13e probed by interviewer
900173 Was question B13f probed by interviewer
900174 Was question B13g probed by interviewer
900175 Was question B13h probed by interviewer
900176 Was question B13k probed by interviewer
900177 Was question B13m probed by interviewer
900178 Was question B13n probed by interviewer
900179 Was question B13o probed by interviewer
900180 Was question B13p probed by interviewer
900181 Was question B13q probed by interviewer
900182 Was question B13r probed by interviewer
900183 Was question B13t probed by interviewer
900184 Was question B13u probed by interviewer
900185 Was question B14a probed by interviewer
900186 Was question B14b probed by interviewer
900187 Was question B14c probed by interviewer
900188 Was question B14d probed by interviewer
900189 Was question B14e probed by interviewer

900190 Was question B14f probed by interviewer
900191 Was question B14g probed by interviewer
900192 Was question B14h probed by interviewer
900193 Was question B14j probed by interviewer
900194 Was question B14k probed by interviewer
900195 Was question B14m probed by interviewer
900196 Was question B14n probed by interviewer
900197 Was question B14o probed by interviewer

R'S LIKES/DISLIKES HOUSE CANDIDATE: DEMOCRATIC

900198 Is there anything R likes about Democratic candidate
for House of Representatives
900199 What R likes about House Democratic candidate -
first mention
900200 What R likes about House Democratic candidate -
second mention
900201 What R likes about House Democratic candidate -
third mention
900202 What R likes about House Democratic candidate -
fourth mention
900203 What R likes about House Democratic candidate -
fifth mention
900204 Is there anything R dislikes about Democratic
candidate for House of Representatives
900205 What R dislikes about House Democratic candidate -
first mention
900206 What R dislikes about House Democratic candidate -
second mention
900207 What R dislikes about House Democratic candidate -
third mention
900208 What R dislikes about House Democratic candidate -
fourth mention
900209 What R dislikes about House Democratic candidate -
fifth mention

R'S LIKES/DISLIKES HOUSE CANDIDATE: REPUBLICAN

900210 Is there anything R likes about Republican candidate
for House of Representatives
900211 What R likes about House Republican candidate -
first mention
900212 What R likes about House Republican candidate -
second mention
900213 What R likes about House Republican candidate -
third mention
900214 What R likes about House Republican candidate -
fourth mention
900215 What R likes about House Republican candidate -
fifth mention
900216 Is there anything R dislikes about Republican
candidate for House of Representatives
900217 What R dislikes about House Republican candidate -
first mention
900218 What R dislikes about House Republican candidate -
second mention
900219 What R dislikes about House Republican candidate -
third mention

- 900220 What R dislikes about House Republican candidate - fourth mention
900221 What R dislikes about House Republican candidate - fifth mention

900222 Interviewer Checkpoint: Type of race - one or two candidates

IMPORTANT ISSUES: HOUSE CAMPAIGN

- 900223 Important issues to R in campaign for House of Representatives - first mention
900224 Important issues to R in campaign for House of Representatives - second mention
900225 Important issues to R in campaign for House of Representatives - third mention

900226 Interviewer Checkpoint: Has R mentioned issues

900227 Issue most important to R in campaign
900228 Did R prefer one of the candidates because of this issue
900229 Candidate R preferred
900230 Party of candidate named

R'S KNOWLEDGE OF HOUSE INCUMBENT

- 900231 Two House candidates running: was either candidate already in House of Representatives
900232 Two House candidates running: which candidate was already in House of Representatives
900233 Two House candidates running: party of candidate already in House of Representatives
900234 One House candidate running: was candidate already in House of Representatives
900235 One House candidate running: candidate number code
900236 One House candidate running: party of candidate

900237 Interviewer Checkpoint: Districts in which House incumbent ran

R'S CONTACT WITH HOUSE INCUMBENT

- 900238 Did R have any contact with incumbent
900239 Did R meet incumbent personally
900240 Did R attend meeting/gathering where incumbent spoke
900241 Did R talk with incumbent's staff/office
900242 Did R receive something in mail from incumbent
900243 Did R read about incumbent in newspaper/magazine
900244 Did R hear incumbent on radio
900245 Did R see incumbent on television
900246 R had contact with incumbent in other ways
900247 Does R know anyone who had contact with incumbent

900248 Interviewer Checkpoint: District in which House incumbent had opposition

R'S CONTACT WITH HOUSE CHALLENGER

900249 Did R have any contact with candidate
 900250 Did R meet candidate personally
 900251 Did R attend meeting/gathering where candidate spoke
 900252 Did R talk with candidate's staff/office
 900253 Did R receive something in mail from candidate
 900254 Did R read about candidate in newspaper/magazine
 900255 Did R hear candidate on radio
 900256 Did R see candidate on television
 900257 R had contact with candidate in other ways
 900258 Does R know anyone who had contact with candidate

R'S CONTACT WITH DEMOCRATIC HOUSE CANDIDATE, NO INCUMBENT

900259 Did R have any contact with candidate
 900260 Did R meet candidate personally
 900261 Did R attend meeting/gathering where candidate spoke
 900262 Did R talk with candidate's staff/office
 900263 Did R receive something in mail from candidate
 900264 Did R read about candidate in newspaper/magazine
 900265 Did R hear candidate on radio
 900266 Did R see candidate on television
 900267 R had contact with candidate in other ways
 900268 Does R know anyone who had contact with candidate

R'S CONTACT WITH REPUBLICAN HOUSE CANDIDATE, NO INCUMBENT

900269 Did R have any contact with candidate
 900270 Did R meet candidate personally
 900271 Did R attend meeting/gathering where candidate spoke
 900272 Did R talk with candidate's staff/office
 900273 Did R receive something in mail from candidate
 900274 Did R read about candidate in newspaper/magazine
 900275 Did R hear candidate on radio
 900276 Did R see candidate on television
 900277 R had contact with candidate in other ways
 900278 Does R know anyone who had contact with candidate

VOTING SECTION: VOTERS

900279 Did R vote in 1990 election
 900280 Was R registered to vote in this election
 900281 Is R registered to vote at current address
 900282 In what county and state is R registered

 900283 Interviewer Checkpoint: Did R vote in 1990 election

 900284 Did R vote in person or by absentee ballot
 900285 Where R has voted

 900286 Interviewer Checkpoint: Is R registered to vote
 in county/state of interview

 900287 Did R vote for House of Representatives candidate
 900288 For which House of Representatives candidate did R
 vote
 900289 R's vote for House candidate - party

900290 Was R's preference strong for House candidate

900291 Interviewer Checkpoint: Was there a Senate race in R's state

900292 Did R vote for a Senate candidate

900293 For which Senate candidate did R vote

900294 R's vote for Senate candidate - party

900295 Was R's preference strong for Senate candidate

900296 Interviewer Checkpoint: Was there a gubernatorial race in R's state

900297 Did R vote for gubernatorial candidate

900298 For which gubernatorial candidate did R vote

900299 R's vote for gubernatorial candidate - party

VOTING SECTION: NON-VOTERS

900300 Did R prefer one candidate for U.S. House

900301 Whom did R prefer for U.S. House

900302 R's preference for House candidate - party

NON-CAMPAIGN CONTACT WITH HOUSE INCUMBENT

900303 Did R or family member ever contact U.S. House incumbent/office

900304 Reason for contact with House incumbent - to express opinion

900305 Reason for contact with House incumbent - to seek information

900306 Reason for contact with House incumbent - to seek help with problem

900307 Did R get response from House incumbent

900308 How satisfied was R with response from incumbent

900309 Does R know anyone else who had contact with U.S. House incumbent

900310 Did person/group get response from House incumbent

900311 How satisfied was person/group with response from incumbent

900312 How helpful would House incumbent be with another problem

R'S ASSESSMENT OF HOUSE INCUMBENT

900313 How well does U.S. representative keep in touch with district

900314 Does R remember a bill representative voted on

900315 Does R agree/disagree with way representative voted

900316 Anything special done by House incumbent for district/people

R'S PARTY IDENTIFICATION

900317 R's party identification

900318 Strength of R's party identification

900319 R closer to Republican/Democratic party
900320 Summary: R's party identification

IMPORTANT NATIONAL PROBLEMS

900321 How often does R follow government/public affairs
900322 What is most important national problem -
1st mention
900323 What is most important national problem -
2nd mention
900324 What is most important national problem -
3rd mention

900325 Interviewer Checkpoint: Has R mentioned any problems

900326 What is the single most important national problem

900327 Interviewer Checkpoint: Form A or B

INDIVIDUALISM

900328 Fitting in with people vs. acting according to your
own standards
900329 Taking care of yourself vs. caring more about society
900330 Raising children to be independent-minded vs. obedient
900331 Strong government vs. free market in handling economic
problems
900332 Being poor due to not working hard enough vs.
circumstances beyond control
900333 Less government vs. more government
900334 Cooperation vs. self-reliance
900335 The main reason government has become bigger

PARTY DIFFERENCES

900336 Does R see important differences between parties
900337 Important party differences: party preference -
first mention
900338 Party difference content - first mention
900339 Important party differences: party preference -
second mention
900340 Party difference content - second mention
900341 Important party differences: party preference -
third mention
900342 Party difference content - third mention
900343 Important party differences: party preference -
fourth mention
900344 Party difference content - fourth mention
900345 Important party differences: party preference -
fifth mention
900346 Party difference content - fifth mention
900347 Important party differences: party preference -
sixth mention
900348 Party difference content - sixth mention
900349 Does R think one party more conservative at national
level
900350 Which party does R think is more conservative

EASTERN EUROPE

- 900351 How much has R heard about changes in Soviet Union/
eastern Europe
- 900352 Does R think the cold war is coming to an end
- 900353 Should U.S. give economic assistance to east European
countries that have turned toward democracy

NATIONAL SECURITY

- 900354 Is Soviet Union or Japan bigger threat to national
security of U.S.

FEDERAL BUDGET DEFICIT

- 900355 Does R approve/disapprove of efforts to reduce federal
deficit
- 900356 Did democrats/Republicans work hardest to reduce deficit

PERSIAN GULF

- 900357 Was sending U.S. troops to Persian Gulf right
- 900358 What should U.S. do now in Persian Gulf
- 900359 Does R approve/disapprove of Bush's handling of Persian
Gulf crisis
- 900360 How strongly does R approve/disapprove of Bush's
handling of Persian Gulf crisis

PARTY CONTACTS WITH R DURING THE CAMPAIGN

- 900361 Did a political party worker contact R during
campaign
- 900362 Which party(s) contacted R during campaign
- 900363 Did anyone else contact R during campaign
- 900364 Which candidate did the contact ask R to support -
1st mention
- 900365 Which candidate did the contact ask R to support -
2nd mention

R'S POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

- 900366 Did R try to influence other's vote choice
- 900367 Did R wear a button, put a sticker on the car, or
put up a sign
- 900368 Did R attend any political meetings or rallies
- 900369 Did R work for party or candidate
- 900370 Did R use \$1 political contribution option on
federal income tax return
- 900371 Did R contribute money to an individual candidate
- 900372 R gave money to candidate from which party
- 900373 Did R give money to specific political party
- 900374 Which party did R give money to
- 900375 Did R give money to any other group supporting/opposing
candidates
- 900376 Was R contacted about registering or voting

INCREASE/DECREASE SPENDING ON FEDERAL BUDGET PROGRAMS

900377 Increase/decrease spending on protection of the environment
 900378 Increase/decrease spending on foreign aid
 900379 Increase/decrease spending on fighting the disease AIDS
 900380 Increase/decrease spending on social security
 900381 Increase/decrease spending for the war on drugs
 900382 Increase/decrease spending on food stamps
 900383 Increase/decrease spending on public schools
 900384 Increase/decrease spending on the homeless
 900385 Increase/decrease spending on childcare
 900386 Increase/decrease spending on programs that assist Blacks
 900387 Increase/decrease spending on the space program

WHICH PARTY WOULD DO A BETTER JOB HANDLING VARIOUS PROBLEMS

900388 Which party is more likely to cut social security
 900389 Which party is more likely to raise taxes
 900390 Which party would do better job of handling the economy
 900391 Which party would do better job of handling the environment
 900392 Which party would do better job of dealing with crime
 900393 Which party would do better job of handling foreign affairs
 900394 Which party would do better job of cleaning up savings and loan business

R'S RECOGNITION OF POLITICAL FIGURES

900395 Does R know what job/office Dan Quayle holds
 900396 Does R know what job/office George Mitchell holds
 900397 Does R know what job/office William Rehnquist holds
 900398 Does R know what job/office Mikhail Gorbachev holds
 900399 Does R know what job/office Margaret Thatcher holds
 900400 Does R know what job/office Nelson Mandela holds
 900401 Does R know what job/office Tom Foley holds

R'S KNOWLEDGE OF PARTY REPRESENTATION IN CONGRESS

900402 Does R know which party had the most members in the House of Representatives before the election
 900403 Does R know which party had the most members in the Senate before the election

R'S ASSESSMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE'S PERFORMANCE

900404 R's approval/disapproval of representative's handling of job
 900405 Strength of R's approval/disapproval of representative's handling of job

POSITIONS ON LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE SCALE

900406 Liberal/conservative scale-R
 900407 If R had to choose, would R consider self a liberal/
 conservative
 900408 Liberal/conservative scale-Bush
 900409 Liberal/conservative scale-Democratic House candidate
 900410 Liberal/conservative scale-Republican House candidate
 900411 Liberal/conservative scale-Democratic Senate candidate
 900412 Liberal/conservative scale-Republican Senate candidate
 900413 Liberal/conservative scale-Democratic party
 900414 Liberal/conservative scale-Republican party
 900415 liberal/conservative scale-the federal government

R'S PERSONAL FINANCIAL SITUATION

900416 Does R feel better/worse off financially than a
 year ago
 900417 How much better/worse off does R feel financially
 900418 Has federal economic policy made a difference on R's
 financial position
 900419 How much better/worse has it made R financially
 900420 Will R be better/worse off financially a year from now
 900421 Will R be much or somewhat better/worse off financially
 a year from now

R'S OPINION OF NATIONAL ECONOMY

900422 Does R think the nation's economy has gotten better/
 worse/stayed the same in the past year
 900423 How much better/worse is the nation's economy
 900424 Does R see the economy getting better/worse/staying
 about the same in the next year
 900425 Interviewer Checkpoint: Form A or B

EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES/RIGHTS

900426 Society should ensure equal opportunity to succeed
 900427 We have gone too far in pushing equal rights
 900428 A problem in this country is that we don't give
 everyone an equal chance
 900429 We should worry less about equality
 900430 It is not a problem if people have unequal chances
 900431 We would have fewer problems if people were treated
 more equally

LIMITS ON IMPORTS/SANCTIONS AGAINST SOUTH AFRICA

900432 Increase/decrease limits on foreign imports scale-R
 (Form A)
 900433 Increase/decrease sanctions against South Africa scale-R
 (Form A)
 900434 Does R favor increasing/decreasing limits on foreign
 imports (Form B)

- 900435 How much does R favor increasing/decreasing limits
on foreign imports (Form B)
- 900436 Does R favor increasing/decreasing sanctions against
South Africa (Form B)
- 900437 How much does R favor increasing/decreasing sanctions
against South Africa (Form B)

WOMEN RIGHTS SCALE

- 900438 Women's rights scale-R

DEFENSE SPENDING SCALE

- 900439 Defense spending scale-R
- 900440 Defense spending scale-Bush
- 900441 Defense spending scale-Democratic House candidate
- 900442 Defense spending scale-Republican House candidate
- 900443 Defense spending scale-Democratic party
- 900444 Defense spending scale-Republican party
- 900445 Defense spending scale-federal government

GUARANTEED STANDARD OF LIVING SCALE

- 900446 Guaranteed standard of living/job scale-R

SOCIO/ECONOMIC STATUS OF BLACKS SCALE

- 900447 Social/economic status of Blacks scale-R
- 900448 Social/economic status of Blacks scale-Bush
- 900449 Social/economic status of Blacks scale-Democratic party
- 900450 Social/economic status of Blacks scale-Republican party
- 900451 Social/economic status of Blacks scale-federal
government

GOVERNMENT SERVICES/SPENDING SCALE

- 900452 Government services/spending scale-R
- 900453 Government services/spending scale-Bush
- 900454 Government services/spending scale-Democratic House
candidate
- 900455 Government services/spending scale-Republican House
candidate
- 900456 Government services/spending scale-Democratic party
- 900457 Government services/spending scale-Republican party
- 900458 Government services/spending scale-the federal
government

JOB DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN

- 900459 Does R favor/oppose laws to protect women against job
discrimination
- 900460 How strongly does R favor/oppose laws protecting women
against job discrimination
- 900461 How much job discrimination do women face

900462 Interviewer Checkpoint: Form A or B

PREFERENTIAL HIRING/STUDENT QUOTAS FOR BLACKS

900463 R is for/against preferential hiring and promotion
of Blacks
900464 How strongly does R favor/oppose preferential hiring and
promotion of Blacks
900465 R is for/against quotas to admit Black students
900466 How strongly does R favor/oppose quotas

SCHOOL PRAYER

900467 R's opinion on school prayer
900468 How strongly does R favor their opinion on school prayer

DESEGREGATION OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS

900469 Does R have opinion on government's involvement in
desegregation of public schools
900470 R's opinion on government's involvement in desegregation
of public schools

BURNING/DESTROYING THE AMERICAN FLAG

900471 Should burning/destroying the American flag as political
protest be legal/illegal
900472 Favor/oppose constitutional amendment outlawing
destruction of flag for political reasons

PROBLEMS IN THE SAVINGS AND LOAN INDUSTRY

900473 Has R heard/read about problems in savings and loan
business
900474 Who is more to blame for problems of savings and loan
business
900475 Is Reagan/Bush/Congress more to blame for savings and
loan problems
900476 Is Democratic/Republican party more to blame for savings
and loan problems

DEATH PENALTY

900477 Does R favor/oppose the death penalty
900478 How strongly does R favor/oppose the death penalty

ABORTION

900479 R's position on abortion
900480 Does R favor/oppose parental consent law
900481 How strongly does R favor/oppose parental consent law
900482 Does R favor/oppose government-funded abortion

900483 How strongly does R favor/oppose government-funded abortion

TAX INCREASE

900484 Would R support/oppose tax increase to reduce federal budget deficit

900485 How strongly does R support/oppose tax increase to reduce federal budget deficit

900486 Would R support/oppose tax increase to clean up nation's air and water

900487 How strongly does R support/oppose tax increase to clean up nation's air and water

GOVERNMENT CHILD CARE ASSISTANCE

900488 Should government provide child care assistance to low and middle income working parents

900489 Would R favor/oppose law requiring national service of all young adults

PEACE DIVIDEND

900490 How peace dividend should be used

STRICT POLLUTION STANDARDS

900491 Should government force compliance with strict pollution standards

JAPANESE COMPETITION

900492 Do Japanese companies compete unfairly or is U.S. blaming Japan for its own economic problems

WHICH PARTY KEEP U.S. OUT OF WAR

900493 Which party could better handle keeping the U.S. out of war

STRENGTH OF U.S. POSITION

900494 Has the United States' position grown stronger/weaker/stayed the same in the past year

900495 Interviewer Checkpoint: Form A or B

IMPORTANCE OF STRONG MILITARY/CONCERNS ABOUT WAR

900496 How important is a strong military force for dealing with our enemies

900497 How worried is R about the U.S. getting into a conventional war

900498 Does R agree/disagree U.S. should stay out of
problems in other parts of the world
900499 How worried is R about the U.S. getting into a
nuclear war

MORAL VALUES

900500 Newer lifestyles are contributing to societal
breakdown
900501 We should adjust moral behavior to changes in the
world
900502 There would be fewer problems if more emphasis was
placed on traditional family ties
900503 We should be more tolerant of people with different
moral standards

R'S FEELINGS ABOUT GOVERNMENT IN GENERAL

900504 How much of the time does R think he/she can
trust government
900505 How much does the government waste our tax dollars
900506 Is government run by a few big interests or for the
benefit of all
900507 How many people in government does R think are
crooked
900508 How much attention does R feel government pays to
what people think
900509 People like me don't have any say about government
900510 Politics are so complicated a person like me can't
understand what's going on

IMPORTANCE OF RELIGION TO R

900511 Is religion an important part of R's life
900512 How much guidance does religion provide in R's life
900513 How often does R pray
900514 How often does R read the bible

900515 Interviewer Checkpoint: Form A or B

900516 R's view of the bible
900517 R's feelings about the bible

CIVIL RIGHTS/POSITION OF BLACKS

900518 Does R think civil rights leaders are pushing too
fast/slow
900519 How much change does R think there has been in the
position of Blacks
900520 Blacks have gotten less than they deserve over the
past few years
900521 Blacks should overcome prejudice without any
special favors

900522 If Blacks would try harder they could be just as
well off as whites
900523 Generations of slavery and discrimination make it

difficult for Blacks to move up

R'S RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE AND PRACTICE

900524 Does R ever attend religious services
 900525 Does R consider self as part of a particular church
 or denomination
 900526 How often does R attend religious services
 900527 Does R go to religious services once a week or more
 often
 900528 R's religious preference
 900529 R's religious denomination
 900530 R's religious group association - Baptist
 900531 R's religious group association - larger Baptist or
 local
 900532 R's religious group association - Lutheran
 900533 R's religious group association - Methodist
 900534 R's religious group association - Presbyterian
 900535 R's religious group association - Reformed
 900536 R's religious group association - Brethren
 900537 R's religious group association - "Christian"
 900538 R's religious group association - Church of Christ
 900539 R's religious group association - Church of God
 900540 R's religious group association - "other" responses
 900541 R's religious group association - miscellaneous
 denomination
 900542 Is R's "other" religious denomination Christian?
 900543 Does R attend/consider self Orthodox, Conservative,
 Reform or other Jew
 900544 What best describes R's christianity
 900545 Does R consider self a born-again Christian
 900546 Religious affiliation summary

PERSONAL INFORMATION ABOUT R

900547 R's gender
 900548 R's age from household listing
 900549 R's race
 900550 R's date of birth - month
 900551 R's date of birth - year
 900552 R's recoded age
 900553 R's marital status
 900554 Highest grade of school completed by R
 900555 Does R have a high school diploma
 900556 R's highest college degree
 900557 Summary: R's education
 900558 Interviewer Checkpoint: R is married or living with
 partner

EDUCATION LEVEL OF R'S SPOUSE

900559 Highest grade of school completed by spouse/partner
 900560 Does spouse/partner have high school diploma
 900561 Spouse/partner's highest college degree
 900562 Summary: spouse/partner's education

 900563 Interviewer Checkpoint: R is male and married/partnered

R'S WIFE/PARTNER WORK STATUS

900564 Is R's wife/partner working now

R'S OCCUPATION SECTION

900565 R's present employment status
900566 Summary: R's working status
900567 Has R (unemployed) ever worked for pay
900568 When did R retire
900569 Has R (disabled) ever worked for pay
900570 Is R (homemaker/student) working now
900571 Has R (homemaker/student) worked in last six months

R Working or Temporarily Laid Off

900572 R's present occupation - census occupation code
900573 R's present occupation - collapsed census occupation
code
900574 R's present occupation - census industry code
900575 Is R self-employed
900576 Is R employed by federal/state/local government
900577 Number of hours per week R works
900578 Is R satisfied with number of hours worked
900579 How worried is R about job security

900580 Interviewer Checkpoint: Is R working now

900581 Was R out of work within the last six months
900582 Has R had to take a pay cut/reduce hours within the last
six months

R Unemployed, Retired, or Disabled

900583 R's last occupation - census occupation code
900584 R's last occupation - collapsed census occupation
900585 R's last occupation - census industry code
900586 Was R self-employed on last regular job
900587 Was R employed by federal/state/local government
900588 Did R work within the last six months
900589 Number of hours worked per week on last job

900590 Interviewer Checkpoint: Is R unemployed

900591 Is R doing any work for pay at the present time
900592 Is R looking for work at the present time
900593 How worried is R about not being able to find a job

R Homemaker or Student

900594 R's last occupation - census occupation code
900595 R's last occupation - collapsed census occupation code
900596 R's last occupation - census industry code
900597 Was R self-employed on last regular job
900598 Was R employed by federal/state/local government
900599 Number of hours worked per week on last job

900600 Is R looking for work at the present time
 900601 How worried is R about not being able to find a job

R'S OCCUPATIONAL DATA - STACKED

900602 R's present/last occupation - census occupation code
 900603 R's present/last occupation - collapsed census
 occupation code
 900604 R's present/last occupation - census industry code
 900605 Is/was R self-employed on current/last regular job
 900606 Is/was R employed by federal/state/local government
 900607 Number of House work/ed per week on current/last job
 900608 Is R worried about job security
 900609 Did R (unemployed/retired/disabled) work within the last
 six months
 900610 Is R (unemployed/retired/disabled) looking for work at
 the present time
 900611 Has R (unemployed/disabled) ever worked for pay

 900612 Interviewer Checkpoint: Is R married and female

R'S HUSBAND/PARTNER OCCUPATIONAL DATA

900613 Husband/partner's present employment status
 900614 Summary: husband/partner's working status
 900615 Has husband/partner (unemployed) ever done any work for
 pay
 900616 When did husband/partner retire
 900617 Has husband/partner (disabled) ever done any work for
 pay
 900618 Is husband/partner (homemaker/student) doing any work
 for pay at the present time
 900619 Has husband/partner (homemaker/student) worked for pay
 in the last six months

Husband/Partner Working or Temporarily Laid Off

900620 Husband/partner's present occupation - census occupation
 code
 900621 Husband/partner's present occupation - collapsed
 census occupation code
 900622 Husband/partner's present occupation - census industry
 code
 900623 Is husband/partner self-employed
 900624 Is husband/partner employed by federal/state/local
 government
 900625 Number of hours per week husband/partner works
 900626 Is husband/partner satisfied with number of hours worked
 900627 How worried is husband/partner about job security

 900628 Interviewer Checkpoint: Is husband/partner working now

 900629 Was husband/partner out of work within the last six
 months
 900630 Has husband/partner had to take a pay cut/reduce
 hours within the last six months

Husband/Partner Unemployed, Retired, or Disabled

900631 Husband/partner's last occupation - census occupation
code
900632 Husband/partner's last occupation - collapsed
census occupation code
900633 Husband/partner's last occupation - census industry code
900634 Was husband/partner self-employed on last job
900635 Was husband/partner employed by federal/state/local
government on last job
900636 Was husband/partner employed in the last six months
900637 Number of hours per week husband/partner worked on last
job

900638 Interviewer Checkpoint: Is husband/partner unemployed

900639 Is husband/partner doing any work for pay at the present
time
900640 Is husband/partner looking for work at the present time
900641 How worried is husband/partner about not being able to
find a job

Husband/Partner Homemaker or Student

900642 Husband/partner's last regular occupation - census
occupation code
900643 Husband/partner's last regular occupation - collapsed
census occupation code
900644 Husband/partner's last regular occupation - census
industry code
900645 Was husband/partner self-employed on last regular job
900646 Was husband/partner employed by federal/state/local
government on last regular job
900647 Number of hours per week husband/partner worked on
last regular job
900648 Is husband/partner looking for work at the present time
900649 How worried is husband/partner about not being able to
find a job

HUSBAND/PARTNER'S OCCUPATIONAL DATA - STACKED

900650 H/p's present/last occupation - census occupation code
900651 H/p's present/last occupation - collapsed census
occupation code
900652 H/p's present/last occupation - census industry code
900653 Is/was h/p self-employed on current/last regular job
900654 Is/was h/p employed by federal/state/local government
900655 Number of House work/ed per week on current/last job
900656 Is h/p worried about job security
900657 Did h/p (unemployed/retired/disabled) work within the
last six months
900658 Is h/p (unemployed/retired/disabled) looking for work at
the present time
900659 Has h/p (unemployed/disabled) ever worked for pay

LABOR UNION POSITION

900660 Does anyone in R's Household belong to a labor union
900661 Who belongs to a labor union

900662 Interviewer Checkpoint: Is R only family member age
14 or older

R'S INCOME AND SOCIAL CLASS

900663 Family/household income before taxes
900664 R's income before taxes
900665 Does R think of self as belonging to a social class
900666 Does R think of self as middle or working class
900667 Does R think of self as average or upper middle/working
900668 Summary: R's social class
900669 Does R feel close to middle/working class

R'S ETHNIC IDENTITY

900670 What does R consider his/her main ethnic group (other
than American) - first mention
900671 What does R consider his/her main ethnic group (other
than American) - second mention

900672 Interviewer Checkpoint: R mentioned more than one group

900673 With which group does R most closely identify
900674 Were R's parents born in this country

900675 Interviewer Checkpoint: Did R mention some hispanic
group

900676 Is R of spanish or hispanic origin/descent
900677 Category that best describes R's hispanic origin

R'S COMMUNITY/RESIDENCE

900678 R's birthplace
900679 Where did R grow up
900680 Community type R grew up in
900681 How long has R lived in present city/town/township/
county
900682 Where did R live before - city
900683 Where did R live before - state or country
900684 How long has R lived in this house/condo/apartment
900685 Does R/R's family own or rent R's home

CONDITIONS OF THE INTERVIEW

900686 Others present at interview
900687 R's cooperation
900688 R's level of information about politics/public affairs
900689 R's apparent intelligence
900690 Was R suspicious before interview
900691 R's interest in the interview
900692 R's sincerity
900693 Did R report income correctly
900694 Interviewer's estimate of R's family income
900695 Was interview conducted in english
900696 Language in which interview was conducted (if other than
english)

R'S REACTION TO THE INTERVIEW

900697 R's reaction to interview: negative - general
 900698 Negative - too long
 900699 Negative - too complicated
 900700 Negative - boring/tedious/repetitious
 900701 R wanted to stop before completion
 900702 R was ill/deaf/tired, interview was hard for R
 900703 R was confused by questions, interview was hard for R
 900704 Doubts over lack of knowledge/suitability for interview
 900705 Doubts over lack of political knowledge
 900706 R was agitated or stressed by interview process
 900707 R angry at interview content
 900708 R concerned about sampling purposes or bias
 900709 R could not read respondent booklet
 900710 R appeared to enjoy interview
 900711 Neutral or no

VOTE VALIDATION

900712 Vote validation filter variable
 900713 Interview ID
 900714 Election Office Number

Location and Verification of Registration Record

900715 Was a registration record found for respondent
 900716 How well does R's name on coversheet match the name on
 the registration record
 900717 Does birth date match
 900718 Month of birth on registration record
 900719 Year of birth on registration record
 900720 Is birthday on record within 10 years of coversheet date
 900721 Is address on registration record same as that on
 coversheet
 900722 Interviewer Checkpoint: Household composition
 900723 Using registration record, did R vote in November 1988
 900724 Using registration record, did R vote in November 1990
 900725 Is coversheet polling place recognizable to office as
 their jurisdiction
 900726 Is polling place given by R right for address on
 coversheet
 900727 Can a record be found when the correct records/precinct
 for this polling place are checked
 900728 Check local phone book to match surname with coversheet
 address
 900729 Does surname spelling match that on coversheet
 900730 Recheck registration records for name as spelled in
 telephone book
 900731 Does address on record match that on coversheet
 900732 Check with office: is one address a mailing address
 900733 Was the registration record found in current &/or
 active file
 900734 Month R registered

900735 Year R registered

900736 Was record located in purged/deceased/cancelled
/to be processed/inactive file

900737 Month record was purged

900738 Year record was purged

900739 Month R registered

900740 Year R registered

Did R Vote

900741 Interviewer Checkpoint: Vote information on
registration records

900742 Does registration record indicate R voted November 1990

900743 Month R last voted

900744 Day R last voted

900745 Year R last voted

900746 Are there any records with 1990 voting information other
than registration records

900747 Do voting records indicate R voted in November 1990

900748 Interviewer Checkpoint: Registration record found for R

900749 Does registration record indicate R voted November 1988

900750 Are there any records with voting information other
than registration records

900751 Do voting records indicate R voted in November 1988

Using Voter Records to Determine if a Registered R Voted

900752 Do any voting records indicate R voted in November 1990

900753 Do any voting records indicate R voted in November 1988

900754 1990 vote summary

900755 1988 vote summary

900756 Summary: assignment of R to vote/non-vote

ELECTION ADMINISTRATION (OFFICE) SURVEY

900757 Month of record check

900758 Day of record check

900759 Number of precincts in office jurisdiction

900760 Length of record check task

900761 Number of forms assigned to this office

Search for Registration Records

900762 How are registration records stored

900763 Were files used to ascertain whether R was registered

900764 How were the records used or accessed

900765 Did interviewer or someone else operate crt

900766 Was name of registrant sufficient to access a record

900767 Can specific address identify who is registered

900768 Is precinct number recorded

Printouts of Machine-readable Master Registration File

900769 Printout 1: Order of the listing

900770 Printout 1: Is precinct number listed

900771 Printout 1: Did interviewer or someone else source the

listing

900772 Printout 2: Order of the listing
 900773 Printout 2: Is precinct number listed
 900774 Printout 2: Did interviewer or someone else source the listing

Card Index File

900775 Order of the file
 900776 Is precinct number listed
 900777 Did interviewer or someone else source the file

Sources Used to Ascertain Whether R Voted

900778 Were primary or secondary sources used to determine if registrant voted in 1988
 900779 Were poll books used as main or supplemental source in 1988
 900780 Were primary or secondary sources used to determine if registrant voted in 1990
 900781 Were poll books used as main or supplemental source in 1990
 900782 Did interviewer herself do actual poll book lookups
 900783 Were secondary sources used to ascertain if registrant voted
 900784 What kind of secondary sources were used

 900785 Who is responsible for transcription of information from polling place onto computer file

 900786 Is entry process complete for 1990 election

 900787 Does office purge for non-voting
 900788 Standard procedure to see if voters live at registration address
 900789 Check for everyone and/or non-voters
 900790 Time interval for check
 900791 How far back were purged records available
 900792 Month records last purged for non-voting
 900793 Year records last purged for non-voting
 900794 Name sufficient to access purged record
 900795 Can specific address identify who was registered
 900796 Precinct number recorded
 900797 Vote history recorded
 900798 Were purged registration records used

Interviewer Notes

900799 How helpful was person operating the computer
 900800 Does interviewer think she would have found more herself
 900801 How helpful was person doing non-computer search
 900802 Does interviewer think she would have found more herself
 900803 Interviewer rating of office's records

DATA NOTE:

The original release of 1990 data included 2,000 cases,

and the ICPSR 1990 printed codebook was produced with marginals for 2,000 cases. However, it was determined later that the interview production of one 1990 interviewer was highly suspect. As a result of a review of cases, it was decided that there was a high probability that 20 interviews were either faked or conducted with ineligible respondents. THESE 20 CASES HAVE BEEN DELETED FROM THE RAW DATA, SO THAT THERE ARE NOW 1,980 CASES FOR THE 1990 NES.

[Deleted case IDs are: 0193,0370,0943,0946,1156,1566,1567,1569,1635,1636,1637,1937,1990,1993,1994,1995,1996,1997,1998,2000]