

Memo to the Member of the 1987 Pilot Study Committee and the Board of Overseers of the American National Elections Study

From: Kathleen Knight, September 23, 1987

Subject: Measurement of Liberal/Conservative Identification

Summary and Recommendations:

The 1987 pilot study <1> included several items tapping general liberal/conservative orientations which have been used in previous National Election Studies. The central experimental manipulation in the 1987 waves of the study addressed the usefulness of adding the quasi-filter, "or don't you think of yourself that way?" to the branching form of the ideological identification question.

The branching form of the liberal/conservative question was piloted in 1983 and added to the NES in 1984. It was intended to solve problems with the seven-point scale identified by Aldrich, Neimi, Rabinowitz & Rohde (1982 AJPS) and to provide an alternative format for obtaining liberal/conservative identification in telephone interviews. This was done by constructing a liberal-conservative question series identical in structure to that used to obtain the traditional index of party identification (see Feldman report to the NES Board, 1984).

The branching form of the ideological identification question succeeds quite well in solving the problems identified by Aldrich, et al. However, it poses a problem for researchers who are interested in separating meaningful ideological sentiment from responses elicited by the pressure to identify in the question series. Although the two measures are highly correlated, (.71 in the full 1986 sample) the branching scale cannot be treated as a strictly comparable alternative to the seven-point scale (in use since 1972) because the seven-point scale includes a quasi-filter.<2>

Analysis of the 1987 pilot data strongly suggest that the distinction between respondents who "don't think of themselves that way" or "haven't thought much about that" and identifiers is an important one. The filter increases the reliability of ideological identification over time. At the same time, the presence of the follow-up probe: "Do you think of yourself as more like a liberal, or more like a conservative?" Allows respondents to be classified as having some degree of identification even if they accede to the filter.

The major recommendation stemming from the analyses conducted to date is that if the liberal/conservative branching questions are to be included in future surveys, particularly as the only alternative to the seven-point scale in telephone interviews, it is urged that the quasi-filter be included.

The analysis also addressed questions about the validity and reliability of the items to provide guidance about which ones should be retained in the event that pressure for interviewing time required some reduction in the number currently included in the survey. This is not a question answered lightly. Obviously a three item scale is more reliable than a single indicator, and it could be argued that three items is not too many to measure a concept as central to political science as ideological identification. But the question at issue is not so much a matter of the number of items as it is of the time it takes to administer them.

Adding to this complication is the fact that these items fit differently into the research agendas of various consumers of NES data. Including some items implies that other batteries will be present as well. For example, feeling thermometer evaluations of liberals and conservatives can be quite cheaply obtained if the thermometer format has already been introduced for candidate evaluations. Using the seven-point scales implies the collection of additional placements for the construction of proximities. Excluding the scale placement items would deprive researchers of an index of correct location which some consider a good indicator of ideological sophistication (see Luskin, 1987 AJPS).

Setting aside the question of the quasi-filter for the moment, the good news for those who have to make choices is that all three of the items are highly, and roughly equally, reliable single indicators of the underlying attitude. Interestingly, the alpha reliability for the same feeling thermometer difference item obtained during each of the three waves of the pilot (.84) is essentially the same as that for an index of the three different items obtained at the same point in time (.83). The two-wave reliabilities for the individual items are similar, with the greatest difference emerging between filtered and "unfiltered" versions of the items. Finally, the location of the ideological feeling thermometer evaluations (near the beginning of the interview for half of the sample, and near the end for the other) had no impact on the ratings. Given the similarities in the reliabilities of the items, it seems that (within reason) those who put together the full interview schedule need be concerned less with the impact of other items on the ideology questions, than with the impact of the ideology questions on subsequent batteries.

Since the choice between items turns ultimately on matters of theoretical appropriateness for particular research needs, continuity with the established time-series, and ease of administration, the following pages provide a more detailed description of the measures along with arguments for their retention. This is followed by further consideration of the effects of including a filter on the identification questions.

If it is argued that a filter is needed on the liberal/conservative identification question, the question immediately

arises as to whether this implies that a filter is needed on the party identification question it is modeled after. The short answer to this question (provisional upon further analysis) is no. Although the two attitudes may be measured in the same way, party identification and ideological identification are not the same thing. The former is more broadly held and more reliable. In order to answer this question in more detail, parallel analyses of the available party identification items in the pilot study are conducted throughout. The final part of this report returns to a more detailed discussion of the reliability and interrelationship of the liberal-conservative items.

DESCRIPTION OF ITEMS

The liberal/ conservative feeling thermometer difference is obtained by subtracting the respondent's rating of liberals (on a hundred point scale where 0 is identified as the neutral point) from his/her rating of conservatives. This creates a relative measure of liberal/conservative affect ranging from -100 to +100. The feeling thermometers used to obtain this measure have been included in every biennial election study since 1964 (with the exception of 1978).

A number of excellent arguments can be advanced as to why the feeling thermometer ratings should be retained in the 1988 studies.

1. These items provide continuity in measurement over the longest period of time.
2. The information provided by these responses can be obtained relatively cheaply in terms of interview time. Once the introduction to the task is read, as it generally is for candidate ratings, other objects can be addressed very quickly.
3. Feeling thermometer evaluations can be obtained over the telephone as efficiently as they can in in-person interviews. In fact, the only apparent difference between the items obtained in in-person and CATI modes of data collection is that the distributions of the CATI items are slightly more continuous. In the in-person interviews respondents are provided with a graphic depiction of the feeling thermometer which is labeled at various intervals. There is a tendency for the distributions to "bunch" at the labeled points. In the CATI mode the lack of a graphic representation appears to leave respondents free to choose any point on the thermometer, although the general tendency is for respondents to "round" their evaluations to the deciles.

Tables 1 and 2 (a) provide summary statistics on the feeling thermometer differences by sample type and wave of interview. In Form A (waves 1 (6/87) and 2 (7/87)) the feeling thermometer ratings were obtained near the beginning of the interview; in Form B they were obtained near the end. In wave 0 (11-12/86) the responses were obtained at the same point for all respondents in

in-person interviews; all respondents in waves 1 and 2 were interviewed over the telephone. Form 0 designates respondents who were not reinterviewed during wave 2. Examination of these tables suggests that there are simply no appreciable differences in distribution of responses obtained in different modes (in-person vs. telephone), different places in the interview (beginning vs. end), or even different points in time.

4. The raw data obtained from the feeling thermometers can be treated in a variety of ways depending on the theoretical and practical considerations of different analyses. Although these analyses focus on the relative evaluations of the two groups as a means of avoiding individual differences in positivity (see Knight, 1984 APQ) the items can be used separately either in their 100 point form or as dummy variables. The feeling thermometer difference can also be rescaled to a seven point equal interval scale anchored at 0, or trichotomized to produce a general measure of affective direction.

The seven-point liberal-conservative scale, frequently referred to as a graphic, or numerical scale, is obtained by presenting respondents with a graphic depiction of a seven-point scale labeled "extremely liberal" at one, "liberal" at two, "slightly liberal" at three, and "moderate/middle-of-the-road" at four. The same labeling conventions are followed for the conservative side of the scale. Since its introduction in 1972, the question has included a quasi-filter. After an introductory explanation of the scale, respondents are asked:

"Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much about this?" Interestingly, only 20.8% of the pilot sample respondents did not place themselves on the graphic scale in 1986. In 1986, 75% of the full sample (n=1082) respondents placed themselves on the scale. This is the highest percent placing since the measure was introduced, but only 2.3% higher than the previous record in 1984.

Since 1980 respondents who acceded to the filter have been asked: "If you had to chose would you consider yourself a liberal or a conservative?" Roughly half (51%) of the respondents in 1986 who initially said they hadn't thought much about this took a position on the forced-choice follow-up.

The graphic scale format has several advantages for some research questions. For example, it is nearly indispensable for collecting proximity data. (Theoretically, this can be done using a branching format, but the number of iterations of the question series becomes tiresome when several objects have to be located.) Numerical scale formats (i.e., describing a seven-point scale without a graphic presentation) were used for some issue questions in the 1987 waves of the pilot study, but not for the liberal/ conservative scale. While questions concerning the comparability of telephone administration of the graphic/ numerical scale remain open, it provides some important points of comparison with the other liberal/ conservative items. The

correlation between pre- and post-election administration of the seven-point scale in 1980 was .69 (n=773). Adding respondents who answered the forced-choice follow-up increased the n classified as liberal or conservative to 1096, but reduced the reliability to .62.

The major disadvantage of the seven-point graphic scale has been repeatedly noted: the label "extremely" at the end-points does not attract many respondents. Thus effectively reducing the scale to five categories for many types of analysis. This question was not addressed in the pilot study because of space limitations. The disadvantage is, however, worth noting because it provides part of the rationale for the next item to be discussed.

It is also worth noting that at the present time, respondents who place themselves at the "moderate" point on the scale are not asked the follow-up probe. This could be done in 1988 simply by changing the skip logic in the questionnaire, and would provide additional data for those who want it without affecting the continuity of the item in the traditional time-series.

The liberal/conservative branching scale is obtained in the same manner as the traditional index of partisanship. A seven-point index is constructed out of questions asked in two steps. Respondents are asked:

"When it comes to politics, do you generally think of yourself as a liberal, a conservative, a moderate, or what?" Respondents who answer "liberal" or "conservative" are asked whether their identification is "strong" or "not very strong." Moderates, as well as respondents who declined to identify as liberals or conservatives immediately for other reasons (DK, no preference, neither) are asked the follow-up probe:

"Do you think of yourself as more like a liberal or more like a conservative?"

This item was obtained in the 1984 and 1986 National Election Studies and is the only liberal/ conservative item in the 1984 Continuous Monitoring Survey.

The advantages of this item are that 1) it is more appropriate to telephone administration since it produces a seven-point index without requiring the respondent to have to imagine a seven-point scale, 2) it allows more respondents to be classified as having some degree of ideological identification (less missing data and fewer respondents located at the mid-point) and 3) the end-points capture a meaningful number of cases.

The disadvantage of the liberal/conservative branching scale in the form described above is that some respondents who really have no sense of identification as liberal or conservative will nonetheless feel compelled to take a position.

The "filtered" version of the branching scale was included in the 1987 pilot study in an effort to determine the extent of the "non-attitude" problem, and to test the efficacy of including a quasi-filter in the first question in the branching sequence. The manipulation is called a "quasi-filter" because it includes the phrase "or don't you think of yourself that way?" as one of the range of response options in the first question. Individuals who accede to the filter are asked the follow-up probe, along with moderates and other "non-identifiers."

Tables 1 and 2 (b and c) present the summary statistics for the filtered and unfiltered versions of the liberal/ conservative identification and party identification questions. Again, it is clear that there are no differences due to form or wave of interview. Roughly ten percent fewer respondents accede to the filter in the party identification question than in the ideological identification question. Although the data are not included in the tables, it is also worth noting that when the feeling thermometer difference is rescaled to seven points (recoded $-100/-66=1, -65/-34=2, -33/-1=3, 0=4, 1/33=5, 34/65=6, 66/100=7$) the means are nearly identical to those obtained for the other seven-point items obtained for respondents in the same sample form and wave of interview. The standard deviations of the rescaled feeling thermometers are consistently smaller than those for the other seven point items, but only narrowly so.

EFFECTS OF FILTERING FOR A SENSE OF IDENTIFICATION

In the early election studies (of both the Columbia & Michigan schools) an assumption was made that explicit ideological sentiments did not play into the decisions of most voters. Therefore, no explicit items tapping ideological identification were included in the early academic surveys. This assumption was validated by the "levels of conceptualization" analysis in The American Voter (Campbell, Converse, Miller & Stokes, 1960). Converse's analysis of "recognition and understanding" in "Belief Systems in Mass Publics" (1964) suggested that about half of the public in the 1956 - 1960 panel possessed some "minimal level of reasonable recognition" of the ideological terms. Later analyses, notably Levitan & Miller (1979 APSR) and Conover & Feldman (1981 AJPS), suggested that some general sense of identification as a liberal and conservative might help citizens make some sense of the political world even if the usage was "non-ideological" (i.e., not policy oriented) in nature. My analysis of the 1980 election study (Knight, 1985 JOP) concluded, on the other hand, that ideological identification among "non-ideologues" had little to no impact on candidate choice. Additional analyses of the 1980 and 1984 studies (presented in Knight & Lewis, 1986, and in my January 1987 memo to the Board) continued in this vein.

The practical conclusion arising from the past studies as well as those reported below is that the respondent's self-report

of whether he/she identifies in a general sense as a liberal or conservative provides useful information about the meaningfulness of ideological sentiment, but that even if respondents say they "haven't thought much about that," or "don't think of [themselves] that way" they are nonetheless willing to express some degree of ideological sentiment, or identification.

Of the 457 respondents interviewed in 1986 and May of 1987 37% acceded to the filter on the ideology question. Twenty-seven percent of respondents who acceded to the filter in wave 1 (May 1987) were not re-interviewed in wave 2 (June 1987) compared to 16% of respondents who identified at wave 1. Forty-five percent of respondents who acceded to the ideology filter in May 1987 had provided an identification on the unfiltered version of the question in Nov./Dec. 1986. Seventy-one percent of those who acceded to the filter on the 1986 seven-point scale (i.e., said they "hadn't thought much about that" when presented with the graphic scale) took the opportunity to decline ideological identification when given the chance to do so in the branching question in May 1987. Yule's Q between dummy variables identifying those who acceded to the ideological filter at t1 and t2 is .85.

In order to consider the impact of the filter in greater detail Table 3 presents a breakdown of mean liberal/ conservative thermometer evaluation by category of identification on the ideological branching question in 1986 controlling for whether or not the respondent acceded to the filter in the ideological branching question in May 1987 -- the first time it was offered as an option. The analysis is similar to previous comparisons of the seven-point (graphic) scale and the branching index. Among ideological identifiers there is a strong linear relationship between the branching index and the feeling thermometer difference ($r = .61$). Among respondents who "don't think of themselves that way" the relationship is substantially weaker ($r = .32$) and intransitive on the liberal side.

Looking at a comparable analysis of the party items (Table 4) we find an even stronger (but not perfectly linear) relationship between feeling thermometer evaluation and party identification in 1986 among identifiers in the wave 1 interview ($r = .79$ calculation available for Form B sample only). However, even among those who acceded to the party filter there is a comparatively strong relationship between feeling thermometer affect and party identification. This seems to occur because the small number of respondents who say they don't think of themselves that way sort themselves out better on the party identification question, with a proportionally greater number maintaining independence (even some of these may have expressed no preference and been coded as independent by the SRC staff).

RELIABILITY QUESTIONS

Due to the press of time a number of reliability

considerations cannot be discussed in detail in this report. However, some further comment must be included about the temporal stability of the items. Tables 5 and 6 present test-retest correlations for all combinations of the same item asked at two or more points in time. These have been extracted from Tables 7 and 8 which provide full information on the intercorrelations between all of the ideological and partisan items. First, briefly comparing the partisan with the ideological items it is clear that partisanship is a resilient concept which can be measured reliably in a variety of different ways. Since the cross-time correlations range between .72 and .92 for the party items it hardly seems necessary to tamper with them further. Even respondents who dropped out of the survey at time 2 (Form 0 respondents) had t0.t1 correlations of .75 and .86 for the feeling thermometer difference and traditional party identification respectively.

Looking at the cross-time correlations for the ideological items (Table 5) in more detail it is clear that reliability is more variable across item versions, but still respectably high in all cases. Interestingly, among respondents who dropped out of the survey the ideological feeling difference thermometer item is much less reliable than the party feeling thermometer difference. Although this could be interpreted to say something about variable panel attrition, a case can be made that ideological feelings are relatively weakly held among those least interested and least willing to talk about politics, while partisan feelings are more robust.

Clearly, the filtered version of the branching index is the most reliable of the ideological items. At $r=.77$ its reliability is similar to that for party identification. Adding respondents who acceded to the filter and then identified as liberal and conservative on the follow-up probe to the moderate leaning categories (on the basis of further analysis not presented here this is where they are most appropriately placed) produces a less reliable item (.71) than the filtered branching index, but a more reliable item than the unfiltered ideological branching question (.60). From a substantive standpoint, this exercise allows the following conclusion: that for the majority who do not bow out when the filter is introduced, ideological identification may have the same importance as party identification does more generally. However, for a large minority of respondents, at least minimally identified by their acquiescence to the filter, ideological identification is something of a guessing game.

Notes

1. Data in this analysis are taken from the ANES 1987 Pilot Study collected by the Center for Political Studies, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan and are available through the Interuniversity Consortium for Political and Social Research. I wish to thank Carolyn Lewis for her willingness to "drop everything else" and aid in the preparation of this report. Errors in analysis & interpretation are the responsibility of the author.

2. This format is called a "quasi-filter" because the option not to identify is included as one of a range of response alternatives read in the question. A full filter is a separate question preceding the item of interest which attempts to determine whether the respondent has an attitude. For the sake of convenience the items with the "quasi-filter" will simply be referred to as "filtered" in the rest of this discussion.

Table 1. Summary statistics on ideological items by sample form and wave of interview.

a) liberal-conservative feeling thermometer differences:

	Wave 0 (1986)	Wave 1 (May '87)	Wave 2 (June '87)
Form A			
avg.	8.67	8.06	6.10
(SD)	(29.72)	(26.89)	(24.86)
n	154	165	175
Form B			
avg.	3.66	6.66	5.51
(SD)	(30.56)	(27.57)	(28.45)
n	171	163	174
Form O			
avg.	1.07	7.19	no wave 2
(SD)	(28.25)	(20.79)	interview
n	75	83	

b) liberal/conservative branching questions - unfiltered:

Form A			
avg.	4.45	n.a.	4.63
(SD)	(1.77)		(1.81)
n	159		159

c) branching question - filtered:

	Wave 0 (1986)	Wave 1 (May '87)	Wave 2 (June '87)
Form B			
avg.	n.a.	4.21	4.47
(SD)		(1.92)	(2.00)
n		123	124

Table 2. Summary statistics on partisan items by sample form and wave of interview.

a) Republicans - Democrats Feeling Thermometer Differences:

	Wave 0 (1986)	Wave 1 (May '87)	Wave 2 (June '87)
Form A			
avg.	-4.52	-4.12	-3.20
(SD)	(34.65)	(30.94)	(26.74)
n	167	176	179
Form B			
avg.	-3.11	-2.95	-3.89
(SD)	(35.40)	(28.61)	(28.55)
n	169	174	178
Form 0			
avg.	-3.61	-0.63	n.a.
(SD)	(40.93)	(35.06)	
n	90	91	

b) Party Identification - Branching Unfiltered Version

	Wave 0 (1986)	Wave 1 (May '87)	Wave 2 (June '87)
Form A			
avg.	2.68	2.80	
(SD)	(1.96)	(1.91)	n.a.
n	179	178	
Form B			
avg.	2.67	2.73	
(SD)	(2.05)	(2.09)	n.a.
n	178	176	
Form 0			
avg.	2.91	2.93	
(SD)	(2.13)	(2.15)	n.a.
n	96	95	

c) Party Identification - Branching Filtered:

	Wave 0 (1986)	Wave 1 (May '87)	Wave 2 (June '87)
Form A			
avg.			2.76
(SD)	n.a.	n.a.	(2.07)
n			144
Form B			
avg.		2.69	
(SD)	n.a.	(2.22)	n.a.
n		140	
Form 0			
avg.		2.33	
(SD)	n.a.	(2.30)	n.a.
n		40	

Table 3. Mean liberal/conservative feeling thermometer difference in 1986 by liberal/conservative identification on the branching index in 1986 controlling for whether respondent acceded to the quasi-filter in the first wave of the 1987 interview.

Wave 1 (May 1987) response to filtered item:

		Identifiers			Don't think of self that way		
		Mean	(SD)	n	Mean	(SD)	n
Strong liberal	1	-37.69	(29.90)	13	-1.00	(19.49)	5
Not strong lib.	2	-24.81	(27.04)	27	-4.21	(19.97)	19
Moderate liberal	3	-11.31	(23.48)	42	-5.00	(21.04)	22
Moderate	4	-1.50	(21.22)	10	5.55	(14.24)	9
Moderate cons.	5	9.79	(26.80)	63	10.61	(23.07)	33
Not strong cons.	6	17.82	(26.94)	62	12.83	(22.46)	30
Strong conservative	7	36.97	(29.42)	33	15.50	(33.04)	10
Total		5.17	(33.39)	250	5.82	(23.08)	128
		eta=	.614		eta=	.341	
		eta2=	.377		eta2=	.117	
		r=	.610		r=	.319	
		r2=	.372		r2=	.102	

Table 4. Mean Democratic/Republican feeling thermometer difference in 1986 by traditional party identification in 1986 controlling for whether respondent acceded to the quasi-filter in the first wave of the 1987 interview. (Form B respondents only, n=235.)

Wave 1 (May 1987) responses to filtered item:

	Identifiers			Don't think of self that way			
	Mean	(SD)	n	Mean	(SD)	n	
Strong Democrat	1	-49.17	(30.32)	36	-22.50	(17.68)	2
Not Strong Dem.	2	-19.47	(18.15)	38	-16.67	(22.22)	9
Independent Dem.	3	-20.00	(24.45)	22	-2.50	(16.66)	6
Pure Independent	4	7.31	(13.79)	13	.67	(2.58)	15
Independent Rep.	5	14.00	(14.54)	15	13.00	(17.89)	5
Not Strong Rep.	6	18.81	(26.55)	21	5.00	(13.23)	7
Strong Republican	7	49.83	(28.11)	29	12.50	(17.68)	2
Total		-4.62	(24.27)	174	-1.63	14.66	46
		eta=	.811		eta=	.602	
		eta2=	.658		eta2=	.362	
		r=	.791		r=	.541	
		r2=	.626		r2=	.292	

Table 5. Cross-time correlations (Pearson's r) between identically worded ideological items.

feeling thermometer differences:

	wave 0.1	wave 1.2	wave 0.2
Form A	.542 (149)	.695 (164)	.613 (153)
Form B	.638 (160)	.692 (162)	.564 (169)
Form O	.387 (72)	no wave 2 interview	

liberal/conservative branching question - unfiltered:

Form A (wave 0.2 only)	.596 (151)
------------------------	---------------

branching question - filtered:

Form B (wave 1.2 only)	.770 (105)
------------------------	---------------

branching question including filtered leaners:*

Form B (wave 1.2 only)	.707 (158)
------------------------	---------------

*adding respondents who first said they didn't think of themselves that way and then closer to liberal or conservative.

Table 6. Cross-time correlations between party items.

Feeling Thermometer Differences:

	Wave 0.1	Wave 1.2	Wave 0.2
Form A			
r	.719	.810	.745
n	(164)	(174)	(165)
Form B			
r	.751	.770	.767
n	(166)	(174)	(169)
Form O			
r	.751	n.a.	n.a.
n	(86)		

Party Identification Branching Question, Unfiltered:*

	Wave 0.1	Wave 1.2	Wave 0.2
Form A			
r	.815	.891	.831
n	(177)	(178)	(179)
Form B			
r	.848	.924	.836
n	(175)	(176)	(178)
Form O			
r	.860	n.a.	n.a.
n	(94)		

*The wave 2 party identification item is not identically worded because it has a "national" focus.

Table 7a.

Inter-item Correlation Matrix: Liberal/Conservative Measures
Form A Respondents

	BRU0	FT0	FT70	BRF1	BRF1X	FT1	FT71	BRF2	BRF2X	BRU2	FT2	FT72
SC0	.611 (137)	.539 (131)	.511 (131)	.619 (128)	.639 (93)	.522 (134)	.494 (134)	*	*	.611 (129)	.470 (139)	.445 (139)
BRU0		.545 (148)	.524 (148)	.587 (150)	.652 (102)	.462 (155)	.483 (155)	*	*	.597 (151)	.559 (161)	.560 (161)
FT0			.960 (154)	.475 (142)	.518 (97)	.542 (149)	.520 (149)	*	*	.551 (142)	.613 (153)	.592 (153)
FT70				.488 (142)	.533 (97)	.523 (149)	.513 (149)	*	*	.535 (142)	.573 (153)	.562 (153)
BRF1					1.00 (105)	.572 (149)	.597 (149)	*	*	.571 (149)	.546 (158)	.541 (158)
BRF1X						.624 (102)	.663 (102)	*	*	.612 (102)	.638 (104)	.642 (104)
FT1							.948 (165)	*	*	.477 (152)	.695 (163)	.645 (164)
FT71								*	*	.507 (152)	.656 (164)	.635 (164)
BRF2									*	*	*	*
BRF2X										*	*	*
BRU2											.577 (157)	.606 (157)
FT2												.953 (175)

* Not Available in Form A

SC0 - graphic scale (86) Q.K1a,K1aa

BRU0 - branching/unfiltered (86) Q.Q4a,b,c

FT0 - feeling thermometer difference (86) Q.B13e, Q.B13h

FT70 - FT0 recoded into 7-point scale (86) Q.B13e, QB13h

BRF1 - branching/filtered (5/87) no pref/don't think included
Q.A20, Q.A20a, Q.A20bBRF1X - branching/filtered (5/87) no pref/don't think excluded
Q.A20, Q.A20a, Q.A20b

FT1 - feeling thermometer difference (5/87) Q.A4a, Q.A4c

FT71 - FT1 recoded into 7-point scale (5/87) Q.A4a, Q.A4c

BRF2 - branching/filtered (6/87) no pref/don't
think included Q.A48, Q.A48a, Q.A48bBRF2X - branching/filtered (6/87) no pref/don't
think excluded Q.A48, Q.A48a, Q.A48bBRU2 - branching/unfiltered (6/87)
Q.A12, Q.A12a, Q.A12bFT2 - feeling thermometer difference (6/87)
Q.A2a, Q.A2cFT72 - FT2 recoded into 7-point scale (6/87)
Q.A2a, Q.A2c

Table 7b.

Inter-item Correlation Matrix: Liberal/Conservative Measures
Form B Respondents

	BRU0	FT0	FT70	BRF1	BRF1X	FT1	FT71	BRF2	BRF2X	BRU2	FT2	FT72
SC0	.671 (148)	.575 (153)	.566 (153)	.585 (148)	.648 (115)	.595 (146)	.595 (146)	.576 (147)	.649 (116)	*	.487 (154)	.480 (154)
BRU0		.594 (160)	.601 (160)	.601 (156)	.638 (117)	.541 (153)	.558 (153)	.689 (155)	.765 (118)	*	.545 (160)	.551 (160)
FT0			.968 (171)	.535 (161)	.570 (121)	.638 (160)	.615 (160)	.477 (161)	.555 (121)	*	.564 (169)	.551 (169)
FT70				.545 (161)	.582 (121)	.618 (160)	.599 (160)	.484 (161)	.560 (121)	*	.542 (169)	.533 (169)
BRF1					1.00 (123)	.695 (155)	.685 (155)	.708 (158)	.734 (121)	*	.594 (162)	.632 (162)
BRF1X						.711 (115)	.709 (115)	.758 (118)	.771 (105)	*	.643 (120)	.680 (120)
FT1							.961 (163)	.620 (154)	.642 (115)	*	.692 (162)	.670 (162)
FT71								.642 (154)	.665 (115)	*	.661 (162)	.655 (162)
BRF2									1.00 (124)	*	.656 (164)	.706 (164)
BRF2X										*	.731 (123)	.767 (123)
BRU2											*	*
FT2												.955 (174)

* Not Available in Form B

SC0 - graphic scale (86) Q.K1a, K1a2

BRU0 - branching/unfiltered (86) Q.Q4a, b, c

FT0 - feeling thermometer difference (85) Q.B13e, Q.B13h

FT70 - FT0 recoded into 7-point scale (86) Q.B13e, Q.B13h

BRF1 - branching/filtered (5/87) no pref/don't think included
Q.A20, Q.A20a, Q.A20bBRF1X - branching/filtered (5/87) no pref/don't think excluded
Q.A20, Q.A20a, Q.A20b

FT1 - feeling thermometer difference (5/87) Q.A4a, Q.A4c

FT71 - FT1 recoded into 7-point scale (5/87) Q.A4a, Q.A4c

BRF2 - branching/filtered (6/87) no pref/don't
think included Q.A48, Q.A48a, Q.A48bBRF2X - branching/filtered (6/87) no pref/don't
think excluded Q.A48, Q.A48a, Q.A48bBRU2 - branching/unfiltered (6/87)
Q.A12, Q.A12a, Q.A12bFT2 - feeling thermometer difference (6/87)
Q.A2a, Q.A2cFT72 - FT2 recoded into 7-point scale (6/87)
Q.A2a, Q.A2c

Table 7c.

Inter-item Correlation Matrix: Liberal/Conservative Measures
Form 0 Respondents

	BRU0	FT0	FT70	BRF1	BRF1X	FT1	FT71	BRF2	BRF2X	BRU2	FT2	FT72
SCO	.653 (60)	.491 (55)	.463 (55)	.645 (59)	.683 (38)	.519 (60)	.543 (60)	*	*	*	*	*
BRU0		.381 (74)	.359 (74)	.657 (73)	.751 (42)	.567 (75)	.568 (75)	*	*	*	*	*
FT0			.958 (75)	.428 (67)	.551 (38)	.387 (72)	.359 (72)	*	*	*	*	*
FT70				.371 (67)	.528 (38)	.367 (72)	.330 (72)	*	*	*	*	*
BRF1					1.00 (44)	.594 (74)	.579 (74)	*	*	*	*	*
BRF1X						.615 (39)	.597 (39)	*	*	*	*	*
FT1							.957 (83)	*	*	*	*	*
FT71								*	*	*	*	*
BRF2									*	*	*	*
BRF2X										*	*	*
BRU2											*	*
FT2												*

* No Wave 2 Interview

SCO - graphic scale (86) Q.K1a, K1aa

BRU0 - branching/unfiltered (86) Q.Q4a, b, c

FT0 - feeling thermometer difference (86) Q.B13e, Q.B13h

FT70 - FT0 recoded into 7-point scale (86) Q.B13e, Q.B13h

BRF1 - branching/filtered (5/87) no pref/don't think included
Q.A20, Q.A20a, Q.A20bBRF1X - branching/filtered (5/87) no pref/don't think excluded
Q.A20, Q.A20a, Q.A20b

FT1 - feeling thermometer difference (5/87) Q.A4a, Q.A4c

FT71 - FT1 recoded into 7-point scale (5/87) Q.A4a, Q.A4c

BRF2 - branching/filtered (6/87) no pref/don't
think included Q.A48, Q.A48a, Q.A48bBRF2X - branching/filtered (6/87) no pref/don't
think excluded Q.A48, Q.A48a, Q.A48bBRU2 - branching/unfiltered (6/87)
Q.A12, Q.A12a, Q.A12bFT2 - feeling thermometer difference (5/87)
Q.A2a, Q.A2cFT72 - FT2 recoded into 7-point scale (6/87)
Q.A2a, Q.A2c

Table 8a.

Inter-item Correlation Matrix: Party Identification Measures
Form A Respondents

	FT0	FT70	BRU1	BRF1	BRF1X	FT1	FT71	BRU2	BRF2	BRF2X	FT2	FT72
BRU0	.764 (166)	.808 (166)	.815 (177)	*	*	.732 (174)	.738 (174)	.831 (179)	.850 (179)	.881 (144)	.716 (177)	.743 (177)
FT0		.971 (167)	.701 (165)	*	*	.719 (164)	.702 (164)	.719 (167)	.737 (167)	.765 (137)	.745 (165)	.751 (165)
FT70			.755 (165)	*	*	.735 (164)	.730 (164)	.761 (167)	.772 (167)	.796 (137)	.756 (165)	.776 (165)
BRU1				*	*	.782 (173)	.795 (173)	.891 (178)	.881 (178)	.900 (142)	.764 (176)	.797 (176)
BRF1					*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
BRF1X						*	*	*	*	*	*	*
FT1							.966 (176)	.758 (176)	.765 (176)	.793 (141)	.810 (174)	.818 (174)
FT71								.788 (176)	.786 (176)	.821 (141)	.800 (174)	.829 (174)
BRU2									.956 (181)	.971 (144)	.758 (179)	.805 (179)
BRF2										1.00 (144)	.776 (179)	.909 (179)
BRF2X											.781 (143)	.819 (143)
FT2												.962 (179)

* Not Available in Form A

BRU0 - branching/unfiltered (86) Q.E8, E8a, b, c
 FT0 - feeling thermometer difference (86) Q.B13a, Q.B13b
 FT70 - FT0 recoded into 7-point scales (86) Q.B13a, Q.B13b
 BRU1 - branching/unfiltered (5/87) Q.A45a, Q.A45b, Q.A45c
 BRF1 - branching/filtered (5/87) no pref/don't think included
 Q.A53, Q.A53a, Q.A53b, Q.A53c
 BRF1X - branching/filtered (5/87) no pref/don't think excluded
 Q.A53, Q.A53a, Q.A53b, Q.A53c
 FT1 - feeling thermometer difference (5/87) Q.A4e, Q.A4g
 FT71 - FT1 recoded into 7-point scale (5/87) Q.A4e, Q.A4g

BRU2 - branching/unfiltered (6/87)
 national politics version, V5287
 BRF2 - branching/filtered (6/87) no pref/don't
 think excluded, V5177
 BRF2X - branching/filtered (6/87)
 Q.A42, Q.A42a, Q.A42b
 FT2 - feeling thermometer difference (6/87)
 Q.A2e, Q.A2g
 FT72 - FT2 recoded into 7-point scale (5/87)
 Q.A2e, Q.A2g

Table 8b.

Inter-item Correlation Matrix: Party Identification Measures
Form B Respondents

	FT0	FT70	BRU1	BRF1	BRF1X	FT1	FT71	BRU2	BRF2	BRF2X	FT2	FT72
BRU0	.781 (168)	.794 (168)	.848 (175)	.886 (167)	.918 (140)	.681 (173)	.731 (173)	.836 (178)	*	*	.685 (177)	.709 (177)
FT0		.972 (169)	.752 (166)	.801 (159)	.814 (135)	.751 (166)	.760 (166)	.750 (169)	*	*	.767 (169)	.784 (169)
FT70			.772 (166)	.816 (159)	.834 (135)	.748 (166)	.774 (166)	.773 (169)	*	*	.756 (169)	.785 (169)
BRU1				.937 (164)	.950 (138)	.730 (171)	.785 (171)	.924 (176)	*	*	.705 (175)	.761 (175)
BRF1					1.00 (140)	.702 (164)	.754 (164)	.909 (167)	*	*	.712 (166)	.755 (166)
BRF1X						.716 (138)	.769 (138)	.934 (140)	*	*	.727 (140)	.776 (140)
FT1							.955 (174)	.726 (174)	*	*	.770 (174)	.769 (174)
FT71								.772 (174)	*	*	.750 (174)	.768 (174)
BRU2									*	*	.720 (178)	.755 (178)
BRF2										*	*	*
BRF2X											*	*
FT2												.960 (178)

* Not Available in Form B

BRU0 - branching/unfiltered (86) Q.E8, E8a, b, c
 FT0 - feeling thermometer difference (86) Q.B13a, Q.B13b
 FT70 - FT0 recoded into 7-point scales (86) Q.B13a, Q.B13b
 BRU1 - branching/unfiltered (5/87) Q.A45a, Q.A45b, Q.A45c
 BRF1 - branching/filtered (5/87) no pref/don't think included
 Q.A53, Q.A53a, Q.A53b, Q.A53c
 BRF1X - branching/filtered (5/87) no pref/don't think excluded
 Q.A53, Q.A53a, Q.A53b, Q.A53c
 FT1 - feeling thermometer difference (5/87) Q.A4e, Q.A4g
 FT71 - FT1 recoded into 7-point scale (5/87) Q.A4e, Q.A4g

BRU2 - branching/unfiltered (6/87)
 national politics version, V5287
 BRF2 - branching/filtered (6/87) no pref/don't
 think excluded, V5177
 BRF2X - branching/filtered (6/87)
 Q.A42, Q.A42a, Q.A42b
 FT2 - feeling thermometer difference (6/87)
 Q.A2e, Q.A2g
 FT72 - FT2 recoded into 7-point scale (6/87)
 Q.A2e, Q.A2g

Table 8c.

Inter-item Correlation Matrix: Party Identification Measures
Form 0 Respondents

	FT0	FT70	BRU1	BRF1	BRF1X	FT1	FT71	BRU2	BRF2	BRF2X	FT2	FT72
BRU0	.737 (90)	.751 (90)	.860 (94)	.847 (49)	.870 (40)	.639 (91)	.632 (91)	*	*	*	*	*
FT0		.967 (90)	.700 (88)	.660 (47)	.662 (39)	.751 (86)	.713 (86)	*	*	*	*	*
FT70			.698 (88)	.668 (47)	.670 (39)	.696 (86)	.680 (86)	*	*	*	*	*
BRU1				.911 (49)	.954 (39)	.684 (89)	.695 (89)	*	*	*	*	*
BRF1					1.00 (40)	.692 (46)	.706 (46)	*	*	*	*	*
BRF1X						.691 (39)	.714 (39)	*	*	*	*	*
FT1							.958 (91)	*	*	*	*	*
FT71								*	*	*	*	*
BRU2									*	*	*	*
BRF2										*	*	*
BRF2X											*	*
FT2												*

* No Wave 2 Interview

BRU0 - branching/unfiltered (86) Q.E8, E8a, b, c

FT0 - feeling thermometer difference (86) Q.B13a, Q.B13b

FT70 - FT0 recoded into 7-point scales (86) Q.B13a, Q.B13b

BRU1 - branching/unfiltered (5/87) Q.A45a, Q.A45b, Q.A45c

BRF1 - branching/filtered (5/87) no pref/don't think included
Q.A53, Q.A53a, Q.A53b, Q.A53cBRF1X - branching/filtered (5/87) no pref/don't think excluded
Q.A53, Q.A53a, Q.A53b, Q.A53c

FT1 - feeling thermometer difference (5/87) Q.A4e, Q.A4g

FT71 - FT1 recoded into 7-point scale (5/87) Q.A4e, Q.A4g

BRU2 - branching/unfiltered (6/87)
national politics version, V5287BRF2 - branching/filtered (6/87) no pref/don't
think excluded, V5177BRF2X - branching/filtered (6/87)
Q.A42, Q.A42a, Q.A42bFT2 - feeling thermometer difference (6/87)
Q.A2e, Q.A2gFT72 - FT2 recoded into 7-point scale (6/87)
Q.A2e, Q.A2g