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>> NOTES ON SAMPLING VARIABLES
During the early spring of 2001 the National Election Studies staff prepared a comprehensive version of the 2000 American National Election Study. The number of cases in this file, 1807, includes all respondents from the 2000 Pre- and Post-Election surveys. 1881 variables are produced by default using the data definition files provided with the raw data for creation of SAS and SPSS system files.

The codebook contains documentation for variables beginning with identification variables which provide the ANES VERSION NUMBER (version number of the data file), ANES DATASET NUMBER (number of this dataset), and ICPSR study number.

The 2000 American National Election Study was conducted by the Center for Political Studies of the Institute for Social Research, under the general direction of Nancy Burns and Donald R. Kinder. Ashley Grosse was the Director of Studies for the National Election Studies and oversaw the study from early planning stages through release of the 2000 data collection. She was assisted by Laurie Pierson, and Chuck Kierpie. This is the twenty-sixth in a series of studies of American national elections produced by the Center for Political Studies and the Survey Research Center, and it is the twelfth traditional time-series study to be conducted under the auspices of National Science Foundation Grants (SBR-9317631, SES-9209410, SES-9009379, SES-8808361, SES-8341310, SES-8207580, SOC77-08885 and SES 9707741) providing long-term support for the National Election Studies. Since 1978, the National 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 2000 National Election Study included Larry Bartels, Chair (Princeton University), Nancy Burns, ex officio (University of Michigan), Charles Franklin (University of Wisconsin), John Mark Hansen (University of Chicago), Robert Huckfeldt, (Indiana University), Donald Kinder, ex officio (University of Michigan), Jon A. Krosnick, (Ohio State University), Arthur Lupia (University of California, San Diego), Wendy Rahn (University of Minnesota), Virginia Sapiro (University of Wisconsin), W. Phillips Shively (University of Minnesota), Laura Stoker (University of California, Berkeley). As part of the study planning process, a special planning committee was appointed, a pilot study conducted, and stimulus letters sent to members of the scholarly community soliciting input on study plans. Board member Robert Huckfeldt chaired the Planning Committee for the 2000 National Election Study which included from the Board: Larry Bartels (Princeton University), Nancy Burns (University of Michigan),
Charles Franklin, (University of Wisconsin), John Mark Hansen (University of Chicago), Donald Kinder (University of Michigan), Jon A. Krosnick (Ohio State University), Arthur Lupia (University of California, San Diego), Virginia Sapiro (University of Wisconsin), Laura Stoker (University of California, Berkeley), and five other scholars from the community, Steven Ansolabehere (Massachusetts Institute of Technology), Janet Box-Steppensmeier (Ohio State University), Clem Brooks (Indiana University), Darren Davis (Michigan State University), and Donald Green (Yale University), and Ashley Grosse (NES Director of Studies).

Two pilot studies were carried out prior to the 2000 Election Study for the purpose of developing new instrumentation and the methodological investigation of concepts previously measured in ANES surveys. The 1998 Pilot Study, one of the most innovative pilots to date, was the first pilot to be fielded during an election season. The timing allowed ANES to test instrumentation that is exclusively related to the electoral context. The pilot study focused on the three high-profile gubernatorial contests in California, Illinois, and Georgia. Several new measures that were piloted include: media usage; social context and communication; need for evaluation; group mobilization; public mood; tone of campaign; awareness of campaign issues; and whether R owns stock. Also, a significant portion of the interview was devoted to the methodological investigation of concepts previously measured in ANES surveys. Among those were: campaign participation; media use; feeling thermometers as measures of awareness; vote intention; and political knowledge.

In March of 2000, ANES fielded a Special Topic Pilot Study, funded by the Russell Sage Foundation, to develop and refine a series of new measures on social trust. Additionally, new items were tested in the areas of trust in elections, civic engagement, need for cognition, and social desirability. New measures were developed for domain specific trust involving neighbors and co-workers. Results indicated that these new measures gauge trust reliably, that neighborhood and workplace trust are related to but distinct from general social trust, and they contribute independently to participation in politics. These items were included in the 2000 Election Study.

Data from the 1998 and 2000 ANES pilot studies are available through the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (respectively, ICPSR 2693 and ICPSR 2936).

Results from these pilot studies were used by the Planning Committee in formulating recommendations to the Board about study content for the 2000 Pre- and Post-Election Survey. Copies of the Pilot Study Reports are available on the ANES Website (www.umich.edu/~nes), or may be obtained by contacting the ANES project staff.

NES Project Staff
Center for Political Studies
Room 4026
Institute for Social Research
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor MI 48106-1248
nes@umich.edu
http://www.umich.edu/~nes

>> 2000 STUDY DESIGN, CONTENT AND ADMINISTRATION
STUDY DESIGN

The 2000 National Election Study entailed both a pre-election interview and a post-election re-interview. A freshly drawn cross section of the electorate was taken to yield 1807 cases. The 65 minute pre election survey went into the field September 5th, nine weeks before election day. The 65 minute post election study, unique to the time series in that no president elect was named for several days, went into the field the day after the election, November 8th, and remained in the field until December 18th.

Because of the study's most innovative feature, a carefully designed mode experiment, the data represent two presidential studies in 2000, side by side. The core study preserves our past commitment to probability area sampling and face to face interviewing: 1006 respondents interviewed prior to the election and 694 were re-interviewed face to face after the election. Supporting the core study, we used the efficiencies of RDD sampling and telephone interviewing: 801 respondents were interviewed by phone prior to the election and 862 respondents were interviewed by phone after the election. As such, the experiment will define sharply the differences between the two modes and allow us to learn what a shift to telephone interviewing will mean for the NES time-series. Further details of the administration of the surveys are given in "Study Administration," below.

STUDY CONTENT

Substantive themes

The content for the 2000 Election Study reflects its double duty, both as the traditional presidential election year time-series data collection and as a mode study. Substantive themes represented in the 2000 questionnaires include:

* interest in the political campaigns; concern about the outcome; and attentiveness to the media's coverage of the campaign
* information about politics
* evaluation of the presidential candidates and placement of presidential candidates on various issue dimensions
* knowledge of the religious background of the major Presidential and Vice-Presidential candidates
* partisanship and evaluations of the political parties
* vote choice for President, the U.S. House, and the U.S. Senate, including second choice for President
* political participation: turnout in the November general election; other forms of electoral campaign activity
* personal and national economic well-being
* positions on social welfare issues including: government health insurance; federal budget priorities, the budget surplus, and the role of the government in the provision of jobs and good standard of living
* position on campaign finance and preference for divided government
* positions on social issues including: gun control, abortion; women's roles; the rights of homosexuals; the death penalty; school vouchers; environmental policy
* Clinton legacy
* knowledge of George Bush Sr. and his previous administration
* fairness in elections; satisfaction with democracy; and the value of voting
* racial and ethnic stereotypes; opinions on affirmative action; attitudes towards immigrants
* opinions about the nation's most important problem
* values and predispositions: moral traditionalism; political efficacy; egalitarianism; humanitarianism individualism; trust in government
* social altruism and social connectedness
* feeling thermometers on a wide range of political figures and political groups; affinity with various social groups
* social networks, shared information and expertise on politics
* detailed demographic information and measures of religious affiliation and religiosity.

Several new concepts addressed in the 2000 study:

SOCIAL TRUST: Over the last decade, research on social trust has exploded. In order to allow ANES to contribute to this research effort, we developed a series of new measures that approach the problem from a new angle. With supplementary funding from the Russell Sage Foundation, we developed measures addressed not to the trustworthiness of people in general, but to the trustworthiness of neighbors and co-workers. Our 2000 Special Topic Pilot Study showed that the new measures gauge trust reliably, that neighborhood and workplace trust are related to but distinct from general social trust, and that they contribute independently to participation in politics. We included these measures in the 2000 NES, again, with support from the Russell Sage Foundation. Together with an expanded set of questions on participation in civic life that are also part of the 2000 study, we expect to see a wide range of exciting new investigations on trust and participation.

VOTER TURNOUT: A particularly vexing problem for ANES has been over-reporting of voter turnout. Over the years we have sponsored a series of investigations trying out possible remedies, without much success. But now it seems that we may have a solution in hand, based on the source monitoring theory of recall. The notion here is that some people may remember having voted sometime in the past but confuse the source of that memory, accidentally misassigning it to the most recent election, when it actually derives from a prior election. We are therefore implementing a new item, with expanded response categories to help respondents be more accurate in determining whether they did in fact vote in November of 2000.

POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE: The 2000 study also sees a slight change in the way political knowledge is measured. In the past, we have encouraged respondents to say they "don't know" the answer to our information questions, partly to avoid embarrassment. But research shows that this differentially encourages "don't know" responses from some people who may actually know the correct answer but lack the confidence to say so. As a consequence, the standard way of putting these questions may underestimate levels of knowledge. In the 2000 study we are therefore encouraging respondents to take their best guesses when answering the political knowledge questions.

SOCIAL NETWORKS: The reality of citizenship is that individuals seldom go it alone when they engage in political activities. Preferences, choices, and levels of engagement are contingent on the location of individuals within particular social settings. The 2000 study incorporates a social network battery. The battery is based entirely on the perceptions of survey respondents regarding the characteristics of their identified discussants.

COGNITIVE STYLE: The 2000 ANES includes two brief but reliable measures of cognitive style: need for cognition and need to evaluate. The first differentiates among people in the care they give to thinking through problems; the second differentiates among people in their tendency to evaluate objects as good or bad. Both are associated with extensive literatures in psychology, which led to their audition in the 1998 ANES Pilot Study. Because of their success there in clarifying turnout, knowledge about politics, voter
decision-making, and more, they were added to the 2000 NES.

SURVEY MODE: Perhaps the most important single feature of the 2000 ANES is a mode experiment, which supplies the ability to compare interviews taken in person (as we've taken them for the past fifty years) with interviews taken over the phone. This carefully designed mode experiment, driven by theoretical and practical interest, allows scholars to test the consequences of survey mode on data quality and reliability. Moreover, it allows the community to assess the impact of what such a change in mode would mean for the ANES times series. The 2000 study incorporates numerous experiments to look at the effects of mode on: 7 pt. scales and branching, response order, don't know filters, and social desirability.

Congressional Ballot Cards and Incumbent Bias

In 2000, ANES redesigned the Congressional ballot card used in face to face interviewing in an attempt to combat overreport for incumbents. The ballot redesign was based on the research of Box-Steffensmeier, Jacobson, and Grant, (later published in POQ, 2000). Moreover, the change in ballot form was intended to eliminate the measurement error in vote report that has concerned numerous scholars (Wright 1993; Gow and Eubank 1984; Jacobson and Rivers 1993; and Jackson and Carsey 2001). Based on three experiments during the 1996 elections - the Ohio Union Study, the National Black Election Study, and the Texas Post Election Study, ANES concluded that a modification to the 1982 style ballot was in order.

The new ballot cards are intended to give respondents two cues in recalling their vote - party identification and name of candidate. Based on the findings of Box-Steffensmeier et al., party is the predominant cue in the revised ballot. To randomly distribute that cue, each respondent had two ballots printed for the interview - one with the Republican listed first, and one with the Democrat listed first. Based on a randomly generated number, interviewers were instructed via CAPI to show the respondent the gold or the blue card. Examples of the redesigned ballot cards are available on the 2000 Election Study Page: http://www.umich.edu/~nes/studyres/nes2000/nes2000.htm.

In another effort to combat incumbent bias, the vote report question was placed earlier in the interview than in previous studies to avoid any possible contamination from thermometers, which ask R to rate their member of Congress.

Features of a CAI questionnaire

Using the capabilities of computer-assisted interviewing (CAI) in the 2000 ANES enabled the introduction of several features that are not feasible using a paper-and-pencil questionnaire. The most significant of these for users of this data are: randomization within batteries or sequences of questions; application of half-sampling to some questions; and random order of presentation of blocks of questions. Randomization within batteries refers to presenting, in a randomly determined order, a series of questions about the same objects (or people). An example would be the questions about the respondent's likes and dislikes of the four main Presidential candidates where the names of Gore, Bush, Buchanan, and Nader were inserted randomly as the first, second, third or fourth person to be asked about in this series. Randomization of names/objects in this way avoids ordering effects that might be obtained if, for example, the candidates were always asked about in the same order in every series of questions where a parallel question is asked about each of the three. Questions where randomization of order within a series was in force are clearly identified in the codebook. Randomization
variables, which allow the user to identify the order of presentation, are provided for all instances of randomized presentation. A few questions, primarily open-ended questions, were half-sampled, so that a randomly selected half of respondents were asked the question. Finally, an order experiment, where a sequence of closed-ended questions was asked early in the interview for a random half of respondents and late in the interview for the other half, was included as part of the mode comparison experiment described below. For both of these features, the relevant codebook entries contain explanatory notes. All random selections were programmed into the computer application of the questionnaire and occurred automatically and independently of other circumstances of the interview. CAI eliminates the preparation of a paper and pencil version which would previously have been published in the codebook.

Candidate information (names, gender and candidate codes) were "pre-loaded" into the application to be used during the interview. The pre-loaded information is included in the released data. However, since paper candidate lists are no longer utilized as field materials, there is no "Candidate List" appended to this codebook, although the term 'Candidate List' continues to be used in the codebook as a reference to the candidate information available to the interviewer (CAPI preload).

STUDY ADMINISTRATION: MODE EXPERIMENT

ANES election studies are traditionally based on personal, face to face interviewing rather than telephone interviewing in order to preserve the quality of sampling and survey response. Given questions that have been raised within the research community about the relatively high expense of face-to-face interviewing compared with the more widely used telephone mode, the ANES Board of Overseers authorized a series of efforts to investigate possibilities for maximizing the use of telephone interviewing. The 1996 and 1998 election studies included smaller mode experiments to test the consequences of mode on survey quality and reliability. The design and administration of the mode experiment in 2000 was guided by the work of a blue ribbon committee and the commission of two reports (available at http://www.umich.edu/~nes/) comparing face to face with telephone surveys. The issues included sample coverage, non-response, item non-response, social desirability bias, and satisficing. Several experiments were designed in the 2000 ANES to gather more evidence on those effects. Those experiments are labeled in the question tags by the letter "E".

Question wording experiments for mode effects

In assessing possible mode effects, the ANES Board of Overseers along with the 2000 Planning committee implemented a number of experiments to analyze response order effects, satisficing, and other possible fatigue effects of phone interviewing.

The experiments, placed almost exclusively in the pre-election survey are: G6, G7, G8, G9, G10, H1, H2,H4, H11, H12, L3, L6, M4, P1, and K2 in the post-election survey. Question tags identify experimental questions with the letter "E". The table below specifies the type of experiment, concept and question number, and the altered wording.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Experiment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal/Conservative - G6, G7, G8, G9, G10</td>
<td>Branching vs. scale format</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much about this? Strong or not strong?

Economy - H1
Response order effects
...gotten better, stayed about the same, or gotten worse
...worse, stayed about the same, or gotten better

Economic Conditions - H2
Response order effects
...or gotten easier for people to find enough work
...or gotten harder for people to find enough work

Economic Expectations - H4
Response order effects
...to get better, stay about the same, or get worse
...to get worse, stay about the same, or get better

Policy Positions on Imports - H11
Don't know effects by mode
...placing new limits on imports, or haven't you thought much about this?
...Do you favor or oppose placing new limits on imports?

Isolationism - H12
Agree/Disagree format
...Do you agree or disagree with this statement
...stay at home or try to solve problems

Govt v. Private Health Care - L3
Response order effects
Some people feel that there should be a govt insurance plan....suppose these people are at one end of the scale, at point 1. Others feel that all medical expenses should be paid by individuals...

Affirmative Action - L6
Balancing and mode effects
Should companies that have discriminated against blacks have to have an affirmative action program?
Should companies that have discriminated ... or should companies not have to have an affirmative action program?

Tradeoff: Environment v. Jobs - M4
Don't know effects by mode
Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much about this?
Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much?

Women's Rights - P1
Don't know effects by mode
Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much?
Where would you place yourself on this scale?

Political Knowledge - K2
Don't know effects by mode
The first name is Trent Lott. What job or political office does he now hold? [DON'T PROBE DON'T KNOWS]
The first name is Trent Lott. What job or political office does he now hold?
[PROBE DON'T KNOWS WITH, "WELL, WHAT'S YOUR BEST GUESS?"]

Telephone wording

Because the questions asked by ANES over the last fifty years have been administered in person, the question text, that we are careful not to alter, reflects the context of that traditional face to face interview. To understand what such a change in mode would mean to the time series we implemented the RDD study with a questionnaire that reflected the necessary changes in mode. The overlap between those questions is approximately 75%. Where questions were to be read differently, question tags are identified with the letter "T".

Pre-election study: administration

Interviewing for the pre-election survey began on September 5, 2000 and concluded on November 6, 2000. A total of 1807 interviews were conducted prior to the election - 1006 face to face and 801 by telephone. The average length of interview was 68.1 minutes - 70.5 minutes in face to face interviews and 65.1 minutes in telephone interviews. The overall response rate was 61.2% - 64.8 for the face to face interviewing and 57.2 for the telephone interviewing.

In an effort to improve response rates, respondents received a pre-notification packet by two day mail, which included a brochure on the study, and a "Monte Blanc" style pen with the University of Michigan seal, and a letter notifying them we would be contacting them and would offer them payment for their time - 20 dollars. Toward the end of the study, ANES staff became concerned that the production goals would not be met by election day. This concern motivated a number of interventions: refusal conversion training for interviewers having difficulty, refusal conversion packets mailed by two day mail, and interviewer incentives, and increased respondent incentives. Interviewers were given ten dollars for every interview conducted after 10/26/01, and respondent incentives were increased from $20 to $40. To take account of those changes, variable V000139a identifies those cases where interviewers received an incentive per completed case, and variable V00016 identifies those cases where R received the increased incentive.

Post-election study: administration

In an effort to cut rising costs while in the field, two segment areas of the face to face sample were randomly selected to receive post interviews by telephone. By randomly selecting forty-seven segments for telephone post interviews, 200 cases were removed from the strict mode experiment.

Respondents again received a prenotification letter. Respondents were informed that they would receive $20 dollars as payment for their time. Incentives were not increased for those who had received $40 in the pre-election.

Interviewing began on November 8, 2000 and concluded on December 18, 2000. A total of 1555 interviews were conducted after the election - 693 face to face and 862 by telephone. The average length of interview was 63.7 minutes - 66.6 minutes in face to face interviews and 61.4 minutes in telephone interviews. The overall response rate was 86% - 86.1 face to face, and 85.8%.
The day after the election, it remained unclear who would be President and issues of fairness were increasingly being raised. To take advantage of this historical moment ANES promptly included additional content on the fairness of the election, the importance of one's vote, and whether R was satisfied with democracy.

Evaluation of problems in study implementation

Two implementation problems arose in the post-election field randomization problem. The first involves randomization and the second involves the mode treatment. On 11/16/00 it was discovered that the seed used to generate randomization in the instrument application was not properly assigned within the CAPI program. Consequently, interviews conducted prior to the correction of this error (or, for interviews started before and completed after correction of this error, portions of interviews) did not have randomization functioning for interview logic. Cases conducted without randomization in the logic were administered as if only 1 choice were available at each point where logic was intended to make a random selection among two or more choices: most of these cases have an identical choice made at each point where randomization was to have been effected. The Form description variables V000127a and V000127b and the randomization variables documented in V001752-V001810 describe the Post randomizations affected.

The second problem involves the 200 FTF Pre cases randomly selected to be switched to Phone administration in the Post (see above "Post-election study: assignment to telephone mode"). Post interviews were completed for 168 of these cases. Among these 168 Post interviews, 5 were mistakenly administered by interviewers face-to-face instead of by phone. These 5 cases are flagged in the Post administration variable describing mode (V000126) as code 7; note that in 3 of these 5 cases, the IWR actually identified the case as Phone at the start of the interview (although it was being administered face-to-face), and telephone logic was followed by the CAPI survey instrument as the interview was conducted: telephone versions of questions were produced for the interviewer to administer. In the 4th case, the interviewer identified the case at the start of the interview as a face-to-face interview, and FTF logic was used.

RESPONSE RATES

The final result codes for the face to face and telephone sample were used to calculate the two response rates below. The pre-election face to face response rate (the ratio of completed interviews to the total number of potential respondents) for the study was 64.8%. The pre-election telephone response rate was 57.2%. The overall re-interview response rate in the post election interviewing was 86% The response rate in the face to face mode was 86.1% and for telephone it was 85.8%.

2000 Election Study: Response Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>completed interviews</th>
<th>response rate</th>
<th>cooperation rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Face to Face</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-election</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-election</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telephone</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-election</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-election</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>85.8%**</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The field and study staff implemented a number of strategies to bolster response rates, including respondent incentives, interviewer incentives, carefully written appeals to respondents sent express mail, special non-response training for interviewers, and extensive refusal conversion attempts. Most of these strategies were implemented during the pre-election study. The post-election study, which occurred during a unique time for the country, was marked by the willingness of our respondents to be re-interviewed. The overall refusal rate (the proportion of all cases in which a respondent refuses to do an interview to the total eligible respondents contacted) for the post election study was 4%.

**The 200 cases from the face to face sample that were assigned for telephone interviewing in the post had a response rate of 84.5% The response rate for all the cases minus the 200 "reassigned mode" cases is 86.3%.

>> 2000 NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY SAMPLE DESIGN

STUDY POPULATION

The study population for the 2000 Pre- and Post-Election Study is defined to include all United States citizens of voting age on or before the 2000 Election Day. Eligible citizens must have resided in housing units in the forty-eight coterminous states. This definition excludes persons living in Alaska or Hawaii and requires eligible persons to have been both a United States citizen and eighteen years of age on or before the 7th of November 2000.

>> DUAL FRAME SAMPLE DESIGN

The 2000 ANES is a dual frame sample with both an area sample and an RDD component. The RDD frame provides coverage of telephone households while the area sample provides full coverage of all U.S. households including those without telephones. Each of these sample designs will be described in the following sections. The 2000 ANES data set contains 1006 area sample cases and 801 telephone sample cases.

>> FTF SAMPLE DESIGN - MULTI-STAGE AREA PROBABILITY

The area sample is based on a multi-stage area probability sample selected from the Survey Research Center’s (SRC) 1990 National Sample design. Identification of the 2000 ANES sample respondents was conducted using a four stage sampling process—a primary stage sampling of U.S. Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) or New England County Metropolitan Areas (NECMAs) and non-MSA 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 1990 SRC National Sample, from which the 2000 ANES sample was drawn, is provided in the SRC publication titled 1990 SRC National Sample: Design and Development.

The 2000 ANES sample design called for an entirely new cross-section sample to be drawn from the 1990 SRC National Sample; no panel component was included.
in 2000. The 1990 SRC National Sample is a multi-stage area probability sample. The 2000 ANES sample was drawn from both the 1990 SRC National Sample strata (MSA PSUs) and the 1980 SRC National Sample strata (non-MSA PSUs). The modification of the 1990 design in which the 1980 strata definitions were used for the non-MSA counties fully represents the non-MSA domain of the 48 contiguous states. This modification was made for cost and interviewing efficiency reasons related to the availability of interviewers in these areas who work on some of SRC’s large panel studies. The following sections will focus on the 1990 SRC National Sample design.

Selection Stages for the 2000 ANES FTF Sample: 1990 SRC National Sample
---------------------------------------------------------------

Primary Stage Selection

The selection of primary stage sampling units (PSUs) for the 1990 SRC National Sample, which depending on the sample stratum are either MSAs, New England County Metropolitan Areas (NECMAs), single counties, independent cities, county equivalents or groupings of small counties, is based on the county-level 1990 Census Reports of Population and Housing (1). Primary stage units were assigned to 108 explicit strata based on MSA/NECMA or non-MSA/NECMA status, PSU size, Census Region and geographic location within region. Twenty-eight of the 108 strata contain only a single self-representing PSU, each of which is included with certainty in the primary stage of sample selection. The remaining 80 nonself-representing strata contain more than one PSU. From each of these nonself-representing strata, one PSU was sampled with probability proportionate to its size (PPS) measured in 1990 occupied housing units.

The full 1990 SRC National Sample of 108 primary stage selections was designed to be optimal for surveys roughly three to five times the size of the 2000 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 PSUs such as a one-half sample or a three-quarter sample partition. Each of the partitions represents a stratified subselection from the full 108 PSU design. The 2000 ANES sample of 44 PSUs is a stratified random subsample of PSUs from the "A" half-sample partition of the 1990 SRC National Sample. Because of the small size of this NES sample, both the number of PSUs (selected primary areas) and the secondary stage units (area segments) in the National half-sample were reduced by subselection for the 2000 ANES sample design. The 18 self-representing areas in the 1990 SRC National half-sample were all retained for the 2000 ANES sample (8 of these remained self-representing in the 2000 ANES and 10 represent not only their own MSA but their "pair" among the twenty additional self-representing primary areas of the full 1990 SRC National Sample design). Nineteen of the 26 nonself-representing half-sample MSAs and 7 of the 14 half-sample non-MSAs were retained by the subselection for the 2000 ANES sample (or 26 of 40 NSR PSUs).

Table 1 identifies the 44 PSUs in the 2000 ANES sample by MSA status and Region and also indicates the number of area segments used for the 2000 ANES sample (see next section on second stage selection).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Sample PSU</th>
<th>National Sample PSU Name</th>
<th># of 2000 NES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 1: PSU Name and Number of Area Segments in the 2000 ANES Sample Showing 1990 SRC National-Sample Stratum and MSA Status.


10/15/2009
### Eight Largest Self-representing PSUs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>New York, NY MSA</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA MSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA MSA</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Chicago, IL MSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Chicago, IL MSA</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Philadelphia, PA-NJ MSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Philadelphia, PA-NJ MSA</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Detroit, MI MSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Detroit, MI MSA</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Washington DC-MD-VA MSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Washington DC-MD-VA MSA</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Boston, MA NECMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Boston, MA NECMA</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>Dallas and Ft Worth, TX CMSA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ten Remaining Largest MSA PSUs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Houston, TX MSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Seattle-Tacoma, WA CMSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>St Louis, MO-IL MSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Baltimore, MD MSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Nassau-Suffolk, NY MSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>Anaheim-Santa Ana, CA MSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Cleveland, OH MSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Miami-Hialeah, FL MSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Denver, CO MSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA MSA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Nonself-representing MSAs: Northeast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>New Haven-Waterbury-Meriden, CT NECMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Manchester-Nashua NH NECMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Buffalo, NY MSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>Atlantic City, NJ MSA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Nonself-representing MSAs: Midwest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>Milwaukee, WI MSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>434</td>
<td>Saginaw, MI MSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>Steubenville-Wheeling, OH (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>Des Moines, IA MSA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Nonself-representing MSAs: South

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>Richmond-Petersburg, VA MSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>Columbus, GA-AL MSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>Jacksonville, FL MSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>Lakeland, FL MSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>Knoxville TN MSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Birmingham, AL MSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>Waco, TX MSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>McAllen-Edinburg-Mission, TX MSA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Nonself-representing Non-MSAs: Northeast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>Salt Lake City-Ogden etc, UT MSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>Fresno, CA MSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>Eugene-Springfield, OR MSA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Second Stage Selection Area Segments

The second stage of the 1990 SRC National Sample, used for the 2000 ANES sample, was selected directly from computerized files that were extracted for the selected PSUs from the 1990 U.S. Census summary file series STF1-B. These files (on CD Rom) contain the 1990 Census total population and housing unit (HU) data at the census block level. The designated second-stage sampling units (SSUs), termed "area segments", are comprised of census blocks in both the metropolitan (MSA) primary areas and in the rural areas of non-MSA primary areas. Each SSU block or block combination was assigned a measure of size equal to the total 1990 occupied housing unit count for the area. SSU block(s) were assigned a minimum measure of 72 1990 total HUs per MSA SSU and a minimum measure of 48 total HUs per non-MSA SSU. Second stage sampling of area segments was performed with probabilities proportionate to the assigned measures of size (PPS).

For the 2000 ANES sample the number of area segments used in each PSU varies. In the self-representing (SR) PSUs the number of area segments varies in (1) Office of Management and Budget (OMB) June 1990 definitions of MSAs, NECMAs, counties, parishes, independent cities. These, of course, differ in some respects from the primary stage unit (PSU) definitions used in the 1980 SRC National Sample so will not be strictly comparable to the 1996 ANES Panel PSUs--particularly in New England where MSAs were used as PSUs in the 1980 National Sample and NECMAs were used as PSUs in the 1990 National Sample.

(2) One selected segment (023) was in a former trailer park that had no housing units to be listed in January 1996. All had been destroyed in 1992 by hurricane Andrew and there were no plans to rebuild.

(3) In the 1990 SRC National Sample, U.S. Census Region boundaries were maintained for purposes of stratification at the Primary Stage of selection. Since some MSA definitions cross Region boundaries, such MSAs were split and the MSA counties recombined in ways that maintained the Region boundary. This PSU actually contains the Ohio counties from both the Steubenville-Wierton, OH-WV MSA (Jefferson County, OH) and the Wheeling, WV-OH MSA (Belmont County, OH) and although it is made up of MSA counties -- it is not a cohesive MSA by OMB 1990 definition.
proportion to the size of the primary stage unit, from a high of 12 area segments in the self-representing New York and Los Angeles MSA PSUs, to a low of 6 area segments in the smaller self-representing PSUs such as Cleveland, Miami-Hialeah or Nassau-Suffolk MSAs. All nonself-representing (NSR) PSUs were represented by 6 area segments each. A total of 279 ANES area segments were selected as shown in Table 1.

Third Stage Selection Housing Units

For each area segment selected in the second sampling stage, a listing had been 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 2000 ANES sample was systematically selected from the housing unit listings for the sampled area segments.

The 2000 ANES sample design was selected from the 1990 SRC National Sample to yield an equal probability sample of 2269 listed housing units. This total included 1972 housing units for the main sample and three reserve replicates of 99 cases each. Table 2 below shows the assumptions that were used to determine the number of sample housing units. The overall probability of selection for 2000 ANES cross-section sample of households was \( f = 0.00002116 \) or 0.2116 in 10,000. The equal probability sample of households was achieved for the 2000 ANES sample 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 used to select the PSU and area segment (Kish, 1965).

Fourth Stage Selection - Respondent Selection

Within each sampled 2000 ANES occupied housing unit, the SRC interviewer prepared a complete listing of all eligible household members. Using an objective procedure described by Kish (1949) a single respondent was then selected at random to be interviewed. Regardless of circumstances, no substitutions were permitted for the designated respondent.

>> AREA SAMPLE DESIGN ASSUMPTIONS, SPECIFICATIONS AND OUTCOMES

The 2000 National Election Study sought a total of 1000 in-person interviews. It was estimated that this would require a ANES sample draw of 1972 housing units. This assumed an occupancy/growth rate of 0.83, an eligibility rate of 0.94 and a response rate of 0.65. These assumptions were based on the 1998 NES field experience. The overall 2000 ANES area sample design specifications, assumptions and outcomes are set out in Table 2, below. A sample of 2269 listed housing units was actually selected for the 2000 ANES study. This allowed for three reserve replicates of 99 cases each. There was no panel component in 2000.

A comparison of the 2000 ANES sample outcome figures to the design specifications and assumptions in Table 2 shows that the actual occupancy, eligibility, and response rates were very close to the expected rates. The actual response rate for the Post-Election Telephone sample was 0.86, which was slightly higher than the assumed rate of 0.85.
## 2000 ANES (RANDOM DIGIT DIAL) SAMPLE

The RDD telephone component of the 2000 ANES is a stratified equal probability sample of telephone numbers. The sample is not clustered. The telephone numbers were selected from a commercial listed one hundred series sampling frame consisting of every possible phone number that can be generated by appending the 2-digit numbers 00 - 99 to the set of hundred banks that have at least two listed household telephone numbers. Hundred banks are the first eight digits of a phone number - area code, exchange, and the next two digits. Each hundred bank defines a set of 100 possible phone numbers. Directory listings are used to define the set of listed hundred series. However both listed and unlisted telephone numbers can be selected from the sampling frame. A small amount of noncoverage of telephone numbers results from household numbers that are in hundred banks with 0 or 1 listed residential numbers. These telephone households as well as non-telephone households are covered by the area sample component.

An initial sample of 8500 telephone numbers was selected from the listed frame for the coterminous 48 states. These numbers were pre-screened by the vendor to remove most business and non-working phone numbers. After pre-screening, 5760 or 67.8% of the 8500 telephone numbers were returned as potentially working residential numbers. The potentially working phone numbers were matched against a file of directory listings to append address information so that Congressional Districts could be assigned. Before sample selection, the telephone numbers were stratified by the competitiveness of the Congressional race (5 levels), whether or not the race was open, and by

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed Interviews</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Rate</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible Sample Households</td>
<td>1538</td>
<td>1564</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>805 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility Rate</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Households</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy/growth Rate</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample Lines</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4) Initial sample lines (PTF and Phone) are different from the Pre-Election completed interviews because of the switch in mode for randomly selected sample cases.
Census Division. A half sample was systematically selected from the stratified file. An initial sample of 2349 cases was selected from the random half sample and the remaining telephone numbers were assigned to 5 reserve replicates of 106-107 numbers each. The reserve replicates were available for use in case the working rate or response rate were lower than expected.

>> 2000 ANES RDD SAMPLE DESIGN ASSUMPTIONS, SPECIFICATIONS AND OUTCOMES

The 2000 National Election Study sought a total of 861 telephone interviews. It was estimated that this would require a ANES sample draw of 2349 telephone numbers assuming a working rate (after pre-screening) of 0.65, an eligibility rate of 0.94, and a response rate of 0.60. The eligibility rate was based on the 1998 ANES experience. Working rate and response rate assumptions were based on the Survey Research Center's recent experience with RDD samples. The overall 2000 ANES RDD sample design specifications, assumptions and outcomes are set out in Table 3, below. A comparison of the 2000 ANES RDD sample design specifications and assumptions to the outcome figures in Table 3 indicates that, although the actual eligibility rate was higher than assumed, both the working rate and response rates were lower than specified in the sample design assumptions. This resulted in fewer interviews being taken in the Pre-Election study. The actual response rate for the Post-Election telephone sample was 0.86, which was higher than the assumed rate of 0.75.

Table 3: 2000 ANES Telephone Sample Design Specifications and Assumptions Compared to Sample Outcome.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed Interviews</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Rate</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible Sample Households</td>
<td>1435</td>
<td>1418</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>1002 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility Rate</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Households</td>
<td>1527</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Rate</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample Lines</td>
<td>2349</td>
<td>2349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5) Initial sample lines (FTF and Phone) are different from the Pre-Election completed interviews because of the switch in mode for randomly selected sample cases.
>> 2000 ANES POST-ELECTION STUDY SAMPLE OUTCOMES

Of the 1807 respondents interviewed in the Pre-Election Study, 1555 completed Post-Election interviews for an overall response rate of 0.86. FTF interviews were attempted with 805 of the 1006 persons interviewed FTF in the Pre-Election study and 693 FTF interviews were obtained for a FTF response rate of 0.86. Approximately 200 FTF cases were transferred to telephone interviewing for the Post-Election study in order to reduce field costs. This was accomplished through a systematic random sample of approximately 20 percent of the area segments. Telephone interviews were attempted with 1002 (201 FTF in the Pre-Election study and 801 Telephone in Pre-Election study) respondents in the Post-Election study. 862 telephone interviews were obtained for a response rate of 0.86.

>> 2000 ANES DATA - WEIGHTED ANALYSIS

The 2000 ANES data set includes a person-level analysis weight, which incorporates sampling, nonresponse and post-stratification factors. Analysts interested in developing their own nonresponse or stratification adjustment factors must request access to the necessary sample control data from the ANES Board.

>> 2000 ANES ANALYSIS WEIGHTS - CONSTRUCTION

Household Selection Weight Component

The joint household selection weight is the same for both the RDD and the area sample. This weight is an inflation factor equal to 34195.298. It is equal to the inverse of the joint probability of selection, which is the sum of the RDD and the area sample probabilities minus their product. It was not possible from the data available to reliably identify the area sample respondents who did not have telephone service. The 2000 CPS March Supplement estimates that 5.5% of U.S. households do not have telephone service. The household selection weight component therefore slightly underestimates respondents who live in households that cannot be reached through the RDD sample frame.

Person-Level Sample Selection Weight Component

The dual frame sample design for the 2000 ANES results in a probability sample of U.S. households. Within sample households a single adult respondent is chosen at random to be interviewed. Since the number of eligible adults varies 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 person-level selection weight is the product of the joint household selection weight and the within household selection weight. The within household selection weight is equal to the number of eligible persons in the household and is capped at 3. 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 ANES estimates of descriptive statistics.

Nonresponse Adjusted Selection Weight
The base weight equals the product of the joint selection weight and the household level nonresponse adjustment factors. Nonresponse adjustment factors were constructed at the household level separately for the area sample and the RDD sample. Nonresponse adjustment cells for the 2000 ANES sample were formed by crossing MSA status by the four Census regions (Northeast, Midwest, South, and West). A nonresponse adjustment factor equal to the inverse of the response rate in each cell was applied to the interview cases. Tables 4 and 5 show the response rates and nonresponse adjustment factors for the area and RDD samples.

Table 4. Computation of Nonresponse Adjustment Weights -- 2000 ANES Area Sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSU Type</th>
<th>Census Region</th>
<th>Response Rate (%)</th>
<th>Nonresponse Adjustment Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSAs</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>55.28</td>
<td>1.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>62.86</td>
<td>1.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td>61.87</td>
<td>1.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>67.82</td>
<td>1.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non MSAs</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>1.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>65.71</td>
<td>1.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td>79.55</td>
<td>1.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>1.200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 Computation of Nonresponse Adjustment Weights -- 2000 ANES RDD Sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSU Type</th>
<th>Census Region</th>
<th>Response Rate (%)</th>
<th>Nonresponse Adjustment Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSAs</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>43.94</td>
<td>2.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>62.08</td>
<td>1.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td>58.72</td>
<td>1.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>53.56</td>
<td>1.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non MSAs</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>67.90</td>
<td>1.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td>62.70</td>
<td>1.595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>67.86</td>
<td>1.474</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post-stratification factor
-------------------------------

The 2000 ANES weights are post-stratified to 2000 CPS March Supplement proportions for six (6) ages by four (4) education categories. Table 6 shows the weighted estimates and proportions for the 24 cells for the 2000 CPS and the 2000 NES. The post-stratification adjustment is computed by dividing the CPS weighted total by the 2000 ANES total weighted by the nonresponse adjusted selection weight. The final two columns show the ANES weighted totals using the final post-stratified analysis weight and the resulting percents, which match the CPS percents.
Final Analysis Weights
----------------------

The final analysis weight (FINAL_WT) is the product of the household level non-response adjustment factor, the number of eligible persons, and a person-level post-stratification factor. The final analysis weight for the 2000 NES sample (FINAL_WT) is scaled to sum to 1807, the total number of respondents. This weight is trimmed at the 1st and 99th percentiles and then re-scaled to match the 2000 CPS proportions for the 24 age by education cells.

Post-Election Attrition Weight
-------------------------------

The 1555 Post-Election cases were post-stratified to 2000 CPS March Supplement proportions for six (6) ages by four (4) education categories (the same categories used for post-stratifying the Pre-Election cases). The post-stratification compensates for differential non-response by age group and education level. Response rates for the Post-Election Study ranged from a high of 100 percent for persons 70 or older with a college degree or higher to a low of 76 percent for persons age 30 - 39 who did not graduate from high school. The panel attrition weight for the Post-Election Study, POST_WT, is the product of the Pre-Election FINAL_WT and the post-stratification factor formed by dividing the CPS proportion by the weighted ANES proportion for each of the 24 age by education cells. The weight is scaled to sum to the number of cases, 1555.

Table 6: 2000 ANES Sample Weight: Post-stratification Factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>2000 CPS Est in 000s (6)</th>
<th>2000 CPS %</th>
<th>Prelim 2000 ANES wtd</th>
<th>Post-strat ANES wtd</th>
<th>Final NES wtd</th>
<th>Final NES centered %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>&lt;High School Graduation</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6,411.4</td>
<td>3.438</td>
<td>2,490.3</td>
<td>2.574</td>
<td>62.08</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>12,223.7</td>
<td>6.555</td>
<td>9,628.2</td>
<td>1.270</td>
<td>118.53</td>
<td>6.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>14,524.8</td>
<td>7.789</td>
<td>11,424.0</td>
<td>1.271</td>
<td>140.81</td>
<td>7.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6,666.9</td>
<td>3.575</td>
<td>6,990.0</td>
<td>0.954</td>
<td>64.73</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>&lt;High School Graduation</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3,242.8</td>
<td>1.739</td>
<td>1,780.1</td>
<td>1.822</td>
<td>31.48</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>12,543.8</td>
<td>6.727</td>
<td>10,873.1</td>
<td>1.154</td>
<td>121.56</td>
<td>6.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>10,759.0</td>
<td>5.769</td>
<td>11,727.6</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>104.32</td>
<td>5.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>College Graduate</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Some College</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>10,786.4</td>
<td>5.784</td>
<td>14,122.3</td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td>104.36</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3,478.8</td>
<td>1.865</td>
<td>2,277.5</td>
<td>1.527</td>
<td>33.74</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>3,300.1</td>
<td>1.770</td>
<td>2,192.9</td>
<td>1.505</td>
<td>32.04</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>9,364.1</td>
<td>5.022</td>
<td>9,558.1</td>
<td>0.980</td>
<td>90.70</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4,136.4</td>
<td>2.218</td>
<td>3,429.9</td>
<td>1.206</td>
<td>40.20</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>7,201.9</td>
<td>3.862</td>
<td>6,060.7</td>
<td>1.188</td>
<td>69.77</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 +</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>7,298.9</td>
<td>3.914</td>
<td>5,033.8</td>
<td>1.450</td>
<td>70.63</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>7,994.7</td>
<td>4.287</td>
<td>6,327.7</td>
<td>1.263</td>
<td>77.51</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4,073.3</td>
<td>2.184</td>
<td>3,811.1</td>
<td>1.069</td>
<td>39.41</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3,303.4</td>
<td>1.771</td>
<td>4,071.8</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td>32.07</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1807</td>
<td>186,470.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>180,100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1807.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(6) Because U.S. citizenship is required for ANES eligibility, the CPS counts
used for stratification include only U.S. citizens.

>> 2000 ANES PROCEDURES FOR SAMPLING ERROR ESTIMATION

The 2000 ANES sample design is based on a stratified multi-stage area probability sample of United States households. Although smaller in scale, the ANES sample design is very similar in its basic structure to the multi-stage designs used for major federal survey programs such as the Health Interview Survey (HIS) or the Current Population Survey (CPS). The survey literature refers to the NES, HIS and CPS samples as complex designs, a loosely-used term meant to denote the fact that the sample incorporates special design features such as stratification, clustering and differential selection probabilities (i.e., weighting) that analysts must consider in computing sampling errors for sample estimates of descriptive statistics and model parameters. This section of the 2000 ANES sample design description focuses on sampling error estimation and construction of confidence intervals for survey estimates of descriptive statistics such as means, proportions, ratios, and coefficients for linear and logistic linear regression models.

Standard analysis software systems such as SAS and SPSS assume simple random sampling (SRS) or equivalently independence of observations in computing standard errors for sample estimates. In general, the SRS assumption results in underestimation of variances of survey estimates of descriptive statistics and model parameters. Confidence intervals based on computed variances that assume independence of observations will be biased (generally too narrow) and design-based inferences will be affected accordingly.

Sampling Error Computation Methods and Programs
-----------------------------------------------

Over the past 50 years, advances in survey sampling theory have guided the development of a number of methods for correctly estimating variances from complex sample data sets. A number of sampling error programs which implement these complex sample variance estimation methods are available to ANES data analysts. The two most common approaches to the estimation of sampling error for complex sample data are through the use of a Taylor Series Linearization of the estimator (and corresponding approximation to its variance) or through the use of resampling variance estimation procedures such as Balanced Repeated Replication (BRR) or Jackknife Repeated Replication (JRR). New Bootstrap methods for variance estimation can also be included among the resampling approaches. See Rao and Wu (1988).

1. Taylor series linearization method:

When survey data are collected using a complex sample design with unequal size clusters, most statistics of interest will not be simple linear functions of the observed data. The linearization approach applies Taylor's method to derive an approximate form of the estimator that is linear in statistics for which variances and covariances can be directly and easily estimated (Woodruff, 1971). SUDAAN and Stata are two commercially available statistical software packages that include procedures that apply the Taylor series method to estimation and inference for complex sample data.

SUDAAN (Shah et al., 1996) is a commercially available software system developed and marketed by the Research Triangle Institute of Research Triangle Park, North Carolina (USA). SUDAAN was developed as a stand-alone software system with capabilities for the more important methods for descriptive and multivariate analysis of survey data, including: estimation and inference for means, proportions and rates (PROC DESCRIPT and PROC
RATIO); contingency table analysis (PROC CROSSTAB); linear regression (PROC REGRESS); logistic regression (PROC LOGISTIC); log-linear models (PROC CATAN); and survival analysis (PROC SURVIVAL). SUDAAN V7.0 and earlier versions were designed to read directly from ASCII and SAS system data sets. The latest versions of SUDAAN permit procedures to be called directly from the SAS system. Information on SUDAAN is available at the following web site address: http://www.rti.org.

Stata (StataCorp, 1997) is a more recent commercial entry to the available software for analysis of complex sample survey data and has a growing body of research users. Stata includes special versions of its standard analysis routines that are designed for the analysis of complex sample survey data. Special survey analysis programs are available for descriptive estimation of means (SVYMEAN), ratios (SVYRATIO), proportions (SVYTOT) and population totals (SVYTOTAL). Stata programs for multivariate analysis of survey data currently include linear regression (SVYREG), logistic regression (SVYLOGIT) and probit regression (SVYPROBIT). Information on the Stata analysis software system can be found on the Web at: http://www.stata.com.

2. Resampling methods:

BRR, JRR and the bootstrap comprise a second class of nonparametric methods for conducting estimation and inference from complex sample data. As suggested by the generic label for this class of methods, BRR, JRR and the bootstrap utilize replicated subsampling of the sample database to develop sampling variance estimates for linear and nonlinear statistics. WesVar PC (Brick et al., 1996) is a publicly available software system for personal computers that employs replicated variance estimation methods to conduct the more common types of statistical analysis of complex sample survey data. WesVar PC was developed by Westat, Inc. and is distributed along with documentation free of charge to researchers from Westat's Web site: http://www.westat.com/wesvarpc/. WesVar PC includes a Windows-based application generator that enables the analyst to select the form of data input (SAS data file, SPSS for Windows data base, dBase file, ASCII data set) and the computation method (BRR or JRR methods). Analysis programs contained in WesVar PC provide the capability for basic descriptive (means, proportions, totals, cross tabulations) and regression (linear, logistic) analysis of complex sample survey data. WestVar Complex Samples 3.0 is the latest version of WestVar PC that is licensed and distributed by SPSS. Information on the latest developments can be obtained at http://www.spss.com.

These new and updated software packages include an expanded set of user friendly, well-documented analysis procedures. Difficulties with sample design specification, data preparation, and data input in the earlier generations of survey analysis software created a barrier to use by analysts who were not survey design specialists. The new software enables the user to input data and output results in a variety of common formats, and the latest versions accommodate direct input of data files from the major analysis software systems. Readers who are interested in a more detailed comparison of these and other survey analysis software alternatives are referred to Cohen (1997).

Sampling Error Computation Models
----------------------------------

Regardless of whether linearization or a resampling approach is used, estimation of variances for complex sample survey estimates requires the specification of a sampling error computation model. ANES data analysts who are interested in performing sampling error computations should be aware that
the estimation programs identified in the preceding section assume a specific sampling error computation model and will require special sampling error codes. Individual records in the analysis data set must be assigned sampling error codes that identify to the programs the complex structure of the sample (stratification, clustering) and are compatible with the computation algorithms of the various programs. To facilitate the computation of sampling error for statistics based on 2000 ANES data, design-specific sampling error codes will be routinely included in all public-use versions of the data set. Although minor recoding may be required to conform to the input requirements of the individual programs, the sampling error codes that are provided should enable analysts to conduct either Taylor Series or Replicated estimation of sampling errors for survey statistics.

Table 7 defines the sampling error coding system for 2000 ANES sample cases. Two sampling error code variables are defined for each case based on the sample design primary stage unit (PSU) and area segment in which the sample household is located.

Sampling Error Stratum Code (Variable 000097). The Sampling Error Computation Stratum Code is the variable that defines the sampling error computation strata for all sampling error analysis of the ANES data. Each self-representing (SR) design stratum is represented by one sampling error computation stratum. Pairs of similar nonself-representing (NSR) primary stage design strata are "collapsed" (Kalton, 1977) to create NSR sampling error computation strata. Since there was an uneven number of nonself-representing MSA and non-MSA strata used in the 2000 NES, and since it was felt that a nonself-representing MSA PSU should be paired with a non-MSA PSU, one of each of these PSUs stands alone within its Sampling Error Stratum Code.

For the 1990 SRC National Sample design controlled selection and a "one-per-stratum" PSU allocation are used to select the primary stage of the 2000 ANES national sample. The purpose in using controlled selection and the "one-per-stratum" sample allocation is to reduce the between-PSU component of sampling variation relative to a "two-per-stratum" primary stage design. Despite the expected improvement in sample precision, a drawback of the "one-per-stratum" design is that two or more sample selection strata must be collapsed or combined to form a sampling error computation stratum. Variances are then estimated under the assumption that a multiple PSU per stratum design was actually used for primary stage selection. The expected consequence of collapsing design strata into sampling error computation strata is the overestimation of the true sampling error; that is, the sampling error computation model defined by the codes contained in Table 7 will yield estimates of sampling errors which in expectation will be slightly greater than the true sampling error of the statistic of interest.

SECU - Stratum-specific Sampling Error Computation Unit code (Variable 000097) is a half sample code for analysis of sampling error using the BRR method or approximate "two-per-stratum" Taylor Series method (Kish and Hess, 1959). Within the SR sampling error strata, the SECU half sample units are created by dividing sample cases into random halves, SECU=1 and SECU=2. The assignment of cases to half-samples is designed to preserve the stratification and second stage clustering properties of the sample within an SR stratum. Sample cases are assigned to SECU half samples based on the area segment in which they were selected. For this assignment, sample cases were placed in original stratification order (area segment number order) and beginning with a random start entire area segment clusters were systematically assigned to either SECU=1 or SECU=2.

In the general case of nonself-representing (NSR) strata, the half sample
units are defined according to the PSU to which the respondent was assigned at sample selection (with the exception of the two unpaired NSR strata mentioned above). That is, the half samples for each NSR sampling error computation stratum bear a one-to-one correspondence to the sample design NSR PSUs. The particular sample coding provided on the ANES public use data set is consistent with the "ultimate cluster" approach to complex sample variance estimation (Kish, 1965; Kalton, 1977). Individual stratum, PSU and segment code variables may be needed by ANES analysts interested in components of variance analysis or estimation of hierarchical models in which PSU-level and neighborhood-level effects are explicitly estimated.

Table 7 shows the area sample sampling error stratum and SECU codes to be used for the paired selection model for sampling error computations for any 2000 ANES analyses. Strata 01 through 26 reflect the half sample 1990 National Sample design used for the 2000 ANES area sample. It can be seen from this table that the three-digit 2000 SE code is comprised of, first, the two-digit SE Stratum code followed by the one-digit SECU code. The RDD sample cases are assigned to Strata 27 through 66. The RDD sample is a stratified unclustered design. In order to reflect the stratification of the RDD frame, the sample was sorted by area code within metropolitan status within Census Division prior to the assignment of sampling error stratum and SECU codes. The sorted file was then divided into groups of 20 adjacent cases to form the strata. Within each stratum, cases were assigned alternately to each of the pair of SECU's, 10 cases per SECU. This assignment of sampling error stratum and SECU codes allows for design effects to be estimated for the complete ANES data set as well as separately for the RDD and area sample components.

Table 7: 2000 ANES Election Study Sampling Error Codes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SE Stratum</th>
<th>SECU</th>
<th>SE Code</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>Segment #s</th>
<th>Total Rs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>011</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>015, 031, 047, 063, 079, 099</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>012</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>007, 023, 039, 055, 071, 087</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>021</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>007, 023, 039, 055, 071, 087</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>022</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>016, 031, 047, 063, 079, 095</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>031</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>011, 028, 044, 060</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>032</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>004, 020, 036, 052, 068</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>041</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>002, 018, 034, 050</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>042</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>010, 026, 042</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>051</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>016, 032, 047</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>052</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>008, 024, 040</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>061</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>007, 023, 039</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>062</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>015, 031, 047</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>071</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>010, 026, 042</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>072</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>002, 018, 034</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>081</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>004, 020, 036</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>082</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>012, 028, 044</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>091</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>011, 027, 031, 039</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>092</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>003, 007, 011, 015, 019</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>122 008, 012, 015, 024, 028, 032</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>152 004, 012, 016, 020, 028, 032</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>141 004, 008, 016, 020, 024, 032</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>132 001, 005, 009, 013, 017, 021</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>191 001, 005, 009, 017, 021, 025</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>181 001, 005, 009, 013, 017, 021</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>194 004, 008, 016, 020, 024, 032</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>196 002, 006, 010, 014, 018, 022</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>220 001, 005, 009, 013, 017, 021</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>226 002, 006, 010, 014, 018, 022</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>211 004, 007, 011, 015, 020, 023</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>213 004, 008, 012, 016, 020, 024</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>230 002, 006, 010, 014, 018, 022</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>434 002, 304, 306, 008, 010, 011</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>239 001, 005, 009, 013, 017, 021</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>240 002, 006, 010, 014, 018, 022</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>262 002, 006, 010, 014, 018, 022</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>255 004, 008, 012, 016, 020, 024</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>257 004, 008, 012, 016, 020, 024</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>258 002, 006, 010, 014, 018, 022</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>273 003, 007, 011, 015, 019, 023</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>274 002, 006, 010, 014, 018, 022</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>260 003, 007, 011, 015, 019, 023</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>250 003, 007, 011, 015, 019, 023</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>292 001, 005, 009, 013, 017, 022</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>293 003, 007, 011, 015, 019, 023</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>464 303, 305, 306, 309, 311, 312</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>466 301, 302, 304, 305, 306, 308</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>470 301, 302, 303, 305, 306, 307</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>477 302, 303, 304, 306, 307, 308</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>280 002, 006, 010, 014, 018, 022</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>482 301, 303, 304, 305, 307, 308</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 1006

Generalized Sampling Error Results for the 2000 NES

To assist ANES analysts, the PC SUDAAN program was used to compute sampling errors for a wide-ranging example set of proportions estimated from the 2000 NES election Survey data set. Sampling errors were computed for the complete NES data set as well as separately for the area sample and RDD sample components. For each estimate, sampling errors were computed for the total sample and for fifteen demographic and political affiliation subclasses of the 2000 ANES sample. The results of these sampling error computations were then summarized and translated into the general usage sampling error tables provided in Tables 8 - 10. The mean value of deft, the square root of the design effect, was found to be 1.098 for the combined sample, 1.076 for the area sample component, and 1.049 for the RDD sample component. The design effects were primarily due to weighting effects (Kish, 1965) and did not vary significantly by subclass size. Therefore the generalized variance tables are produced by multiplying the simple random sampling standard error for each proportion and sample size by the average deft for the set of sampling error computations.

Incorporating the pattern of "design effects" observed in the extensive set of example computations, Tables 8 - 10 provide approximate standard errors for percentage estimates based on the 2000 NES. To use the tables, examine the column heading to find the percentage value which best approximates the value of the estimated percentage that is of interest. 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 Tables 8 - 10 are a useful tool for initial, cursory examination of the ANES 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.

Table 8: Generalized Variance Table.
2000 ANES election Survey - Combined Sample.

APPROXIMATE STANDARD ERRORS FOR PERCENTAGES

==============================================================================
For percentage estimates near:
Sample n | 50%  | 40% or 60% | 30% or 70% | 20% or 80% | 10% or 90%
---|------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------
100  | 5.49 | 5.38      | 5.03      | 4.39      | 3.29      |
200  | 3.88 | 3.80      | 3.56      | 3.10      | 2.33      |
300  | 3.17 | 3.10      | 2.90      | 2.54      | 1.90      |
400  | 2.74 | 2.69      | 2.52      | 2.20      | 1.65      |
500  | 2.45 | 2.40      | 2.25      | 1.96      | 1.47      |
600  | 2.24 | 2.20      | 2.05      | 1.79      | 1.34      |
700  | 2.07 | 2.03      | 1.90      | 1.66      | 1.24      

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample n</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Generalized Variance Table.
2000 ANES election Survey - Area Sample.

APPROXIMATE STANDARD ERRORS FOR PERCENTAGES

==============================================================================
For percentage estimates near:
Sample n     50%          40%          30%        20%          10%
or 60%       or 70%      or 80%       or 90%
==============================================================================

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample n</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Generalized Variance Table.
2000 ANES election Survey - RDD Sample.

APPROXIMATE STANDARD ERRORS FOR PERCENTAGES

==============================================================================
For percentage estimates near:
Sample n     50%          40%          30%        20%          10%
or 60%       or 70%      or 80%       or 90%
==============================================================================
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>> NOTES ON CONFIDENTIAL VARIABLES

Starting with the 1986 Election Study, ANES has released occupation code variables in somewhat less detail than in years past. The full release of this dataset will includes a two-digit code with 71 categories corresponding to Census Bureau occupational groupings. Those who need the full occupation code for their research should contact the ANES project staff for information about the conditions under which access may be provided. Similarly, the National Election Studies have not included information for census tracts or minor civil divisions since 1978. Beginning this year, we have omitted county name. This new procedure was implemented to protect the anonymity of respondents living in sparsely populated counties. 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 ANES project staff. Coding of the new religious denomination variable is in some cases based on an alphabetic "other, please specify" variable. This variable is restricted for reasons of confidentiality, but access may be provided to...
legitimate scholars under established ANES procedures.

OPEN-ENDED MATERIALS

Traditionally, the National Election Studies have contained several minutes of open-ended responses (for example, the candidate 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 which respect the ANES 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 ANES project staff for further details.

>> 2000 FILE STRUCTURE AND NOTE ON "DATASET NUMBER" AND "VERSION NUMBER"

The data file for the AMERICAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY, 2000: PRE- AND POST-ELECTION STUDY is constructed with a single logical record for each respondent. There are 1881 variables for 1807 respondents.

NES "Dataset number"
---------------------
In early 1999, each unique dataset in the ANES archive was assigned a "Dataset number". Dataset numbers for datasets from all archived NES studies are included in the ANES "VERSION TABLE" described below.

"Versions" of ANES datasets
---------------------------
The term "dataset" used by ANES refers to the following associated components:
1- ASCII data file (.dat file)
2- SAS and SPSS data definition files (.sas, .sps files)
3- Codebook files (.cbk file(s))

Components of the initial release of a dataset will be identified as version 01. According to this system, a corrected component of a specific dataset is called a new "VERSION" of that component and is assigned a new "Version Number."

Because the initial release of a dataset is sometimes followed by corrections to one or more components, a labeling method has been implemented to identify the release version of the dataset component(s). In practice, the version labeling will allow the analyst to easily verify if he or she has the most up to date component(s) for that dataset.

The version number of a particular component file is written as the first information in the machine-readable component file:

1) In the ASCII data file (.dat file), the version number of that data file is written in each record in columns 1-2.

2) In the SAS and SPSS data definition files, the version number

of the file** is written in the very first line as a comment similar to the following:
* Version 01 SAS DATA DEFINITION FILE ;
  or:
* Version 01 SPSS DATA DEFINITION FILE

3) In the codebook file**, the version number is written as the first line similar to the following:
VERSION 01 CODEBOOK

NES Dataset "Version Table"
-----------------------------

The ANES Web site (www.umich.edu/~nes) includes an ANES Dataset "Version Table" which can be used to identify the latest version of component files for released ANES datasets.

-----------

^NOTE: A codebook usually comprises 3 files, an 'intro' file, variable file, and appendix file

**NOTE: Since SAS and SPSS data definition files (.sas and .sps files) are identified together as a single component, a new "version" of either signifies a new "version" of both, even if only one data definition file required correction. The "Note" field in the ANES VERSION TABLE will indicate if only one file has actually been corrected. Similarly, since most codebooks are released as 3 files, a correction to any one of the codebook files results in a new "version" of all 3 codebook files at once. Again, the "Note" field in the ANES VERSION TABLE will indicate if only one codebook file has actually been corrected. (All 3 codebook files will include the version number in the first line of the machine-readable file, as indicated above.)

>> 2000 CODEBOOK INFORMATION

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

Note that ANES 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-NOT AVAILABLE IN ADVANCE RELEASE
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) TO VOTE.
8
9  ..............................................................
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>1. YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>2. NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>8. DK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9. NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422</td>
<td>0. INAP., R VOTED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 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. NOTE: marginals may be present as a table following the list of codes.
Due to the complexity of the dataset, ANES staff have created the table below to assist users in navigating through numerous variables representing different formats.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARD FORMAT</th>
<th>EXPERIMENTAL FORMAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 7-point scale</td>
<td>Branching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Response order a,b,c</td>
<td>Response order c,b,a *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Response order a,c,b</td>
<td>Response order c,a,b *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c. Response order 7 pt scale</td>
<td>Reversed scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. &quot;Haven't thought&quot; response</td>
<td>No response &quot;haven't thought much&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. No response &quot;Haven't thought&quot;</td>
<td>Response &quot;haven't thought much&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Agree/disagree with policy</td>
<td>Choose policy / opposing policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Yes/no agree with position</td>
<td>Choose position/ statement of opposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. No use of probe for DK</td>
<td>Use of probe for DK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRE</th>
<th>STANDARD FORMAT</th>
<th>EXPERIMENTAL FORMAT</th>
<th>EXPER</th>
<th>STANDARD AND EXPERIMENTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOPIC</td>
<td>FORMAT</td>
<td>TYPE</td>
<td>FORMAT</td>
<td>TYPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal-Conservative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- FTF</td>
<td>V000439</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>V000446a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Phone</td>
<td>V000439a</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>V000446b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- FTF &amp; Phone</td>
<td>V000440,441,441a</td>
<td>V000442-445</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>V000446,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- FTF</td>
<td>V000448</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Phone</td>
<td>V000448a</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- FTF &amp; Phone</td>
<td>V000449</td>
<td>V000450-453</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>V000454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- FTF</td>
<td>V000455,457</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Phone</td>
<td>V000455a,458</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- FTF &amp; Phone</td>
<td>V000456,458a</td>
<td>V000459-462,464</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>V000463,464a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW Bush</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- FTF</td>
<td>V000465,467</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Phone</td>
<td>V000465a,468</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- FTF &amp; Phone</td>
<td>V000466,466a</td>
<td>V000469-472,474</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>V000473,474a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- FTF</td>
<td>V000475,477</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Phone</td>
<td>V000475a,478</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- FTF &amp; Phone</td>
<td>V000476,476a</td>
<td>V000479-482,484</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>V000483,484a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Econ retrospective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- FTF</td>
<td>V000488a</td>
<td>V000488b</td>
<td>2a</td>
<td>V000491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment retrospective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- FTF</td>
<td>V000492a</td>
<td>V000492b</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>V000495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Econ prospective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- FTF</td>
<td>V000496a</td>
<td>V000496b</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>V000499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit imports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- FTF</td>
<td>V000511a</td>
<td>V000511b</td>
<td>3a</td>
<td>V000512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolationism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- FTF</td>
<td>V000513a</td>
<td>V000513b</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>V000514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govt med insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- FTF</td>
<td>V000608a</td>
<td>V000608b</td>
<td>2c</td>
<td>V000609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST TOPIC</td>
<td>STANDARD FORMAT</td>
<td>EXPERIMENTAL FORMAT</td>
<td>EXPERIMENTAL TYPE</td>
<td>COMBINED STANDARD AND EXPERIMENTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge (office)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trent Lott</td>
<td>V001446a</td>
<td>V001446b,1448</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>V001447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Rehnquist</td>
<td>V001449a</td>
<td>V001449b,1451</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>V001450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Blair</td>
<td>V001452a</td>
<td>V001452b,1454</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>V001453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Reno</td>
<td>V001455a</td>
<td>V001455b,1457</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>V001456</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

>> 2000 CODEBOOK INFORMATION - POLICY PLACEMENTS, EXPERIMENTS, AND BUILT VARIABLES

Policy placements, traditionally done on 7 point scales, of self and others is particularly complicated with mode, various experiments, and built variables. To assist users, ANES staff have created the table below so that users can quickly identify the variable of interest.

**TABLE 1 - PRE 7-POINT SCALE/ BRANCHING SERIES**

**SELF-PLACEMENTS**

_ALL SERIES exc.Lib-Con (SEE Table 3)_

**SERIES: L1 = SPENDING/SERVICES**
L2 = DEFENSE SPENDING
L3 = GOVT/PRIVATE MEDICAL INSURANCE
L4 = JOBS/STD LIVING
L5 = AID TO BLACKS
M4 = ENVIRONMENT VS. JOBS
P1 = WOMEN'S ROLE
P2 = ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION

**EXPERIMENTS:** L3, M4, P1 self-placements
Note: Prefix "V000" omitted in variable numbers listed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FTF = 7PT SCALE</th>
<th>PHONE = BRANCHING</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>L3</th>
<th>L4</th>
<th>L5</th>
<th>M4</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a. FTF:standard</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>608a</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>707a</td>
<td>754a</td>
<td>771</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. FTF:experimental</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>608b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>707b</td>
<td>754b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. FTF:combined</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. PHONE: version 1</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>582/3</td>
<td>610a</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>709a</td>
<td>756a</td>
<td>772</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. PHONE: version 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>610b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>709b</td>
<td>756b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c. PHONE: combined</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PHONE: 'strength'</td>
<td>547/8</td>
<td>584/5</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>617/8</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. PHONE: 5pt summary</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>773/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ALL: 5pt summary</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>776</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2 - PRE
7POINT SCALE/ BRANCHING SERIES

CANDIDATE AND PARTY PLACEMENTS

ALL SERIES exc.Lib-Con (Table 3)

Note: Prefix "V000" omitted in variable numbers listed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FTF = 7PT SCALE</th>
<th>PHONE = BRANCHING</th>
<th>CLINTON</th>
<th>GORE</th>
<th>BUSH</th>
<th>DEM PTY</th>
<th>REP PTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1 Spending/services</td>
<td></td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. FTF</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>575</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. PHONE</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>576</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PHONE: STRENGTH</td>
<td>553/54</td>
<td>559/60</td>
<td>565/66</td>
<td>571/72</td>
<td>577/78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. PHONE: 5PT SUMMARY</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>579</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ALL: 5PT SUMMARY</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L2 Defense spending

1. FTF | - | 588 | 593 | 598 | 603 |
2. PHONE | - | 589 | 594 | 599 | 604 |
3. PHONE: STRENGTH | - | 590 | 595 | 600 | 605 |
4. PHONE: 5PT SUMMARY | - | 591 | 596 | 601 | 606 |
5. ALL: 5PT SUMMARY | - | 592 | 597 | 602 | 607 |

--no cand/party placements in L3--

<health insurance>

L4 Jobs/std living

1. FTF | - | 588 | 593 | 598 | 603 |
2. PHONE | - | 589 | 594 | 599 | 604 |
3. PHONE: STRENGTH | - | 590 | 595 | 600 | 605 |
4. PHONE: 5PT SUMMARY | - | 591 | 596 | 601 | 606 |
### Table 3 - Pre Liberal-Conservative (G Series)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Clinton</th>
<th>Gore</th>
<th>Bush</th>
<th>Buchanan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STANDARD</strong></td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. FTF</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. PHONE</td>
<td>439a</td>
<td>448a</td>
<td>455a</td>
<td>465a</td>
<td>475a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PHONE: STRENGTH</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. PHONE: 5PT SUMMARY</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ALL: 5PT SUMMARY</td>
<td>441a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M4 Envir vs. jobs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. FTF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. PHONE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PHONE: STRENGTH</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. PHONE: 5PT SUMMARY</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ALL: 5PT SUMMARY</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P1 Women's role</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. FTF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. PHONE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PHONE: STRENGTH</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. PHONE: 5PT SUMMARY</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ALL: 5PT SUMMARY</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Prefix "V000" omitted in variable numbers listed.

STANDARD = 7PT SCALE RATING (FTF and/or PHONE)
EXPERIMENTAL = BRANCHING SERIES (FTF and/or PHONE)
BOTH = STANDARD AND EXPERIMENTAL

---

Table 3 of 81
10/15/2009
7. EXPERIMENT  FTF & PHONE             442     450     459     469     479
8. EXPERIMENT  FTF & PHONE: FOLLOWUPS  443-5   451/2   460/1   470/1   480/1
9. EXPERIMENT  5PT SUMMARY FTF & PH     -      453     462     472     482
10. BOTH       5PT SUMMARY                  -      454     463     473     483
11. BOTH       7PT SUMMARY: FTF & PH     446     -       -       -       -
11a.BOTH      7PT SUMMARY: FTF ONLY     446a    -       -       -       -
11b.BOTH      7PT SUMMARY: PHONE ONLY   446b    -       -       -       -
12. BOTH       3PT SUMMARY: FTF & PH     447     -       -       -       -
13. EXPERIMENT  FTF & PH - CERTAINTY    -       -      464     474     484
14. BOTH       CERTAINTY SUMMARY         -       -      464a    474a    484a

**TABLE 4 - Post**

7POINT SCALE/ BRANCHING SERIES

LIBERAL - CONSERVATIVE G1-G10

ALL 7-POINT SCALES (FTF and PHONE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACEMENT</th>
<th>'CHOICE'</th>
<th>3 CATEGORY SUMM</th>
<th>CERTAINTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SELF</td>
<td>V001368</td>
<td>V001369</td>
<td>V001370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLINTON</td>
<td>V001371</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GORE</td>
<td>V001372</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW BUSH</td>
<td>V001374</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUCHANAN</td>
<td>V001376</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM HSE CAND*</td>
<td>V001378a,b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP HSE CAND*</td>
<td>V001380a,b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM PARTY</td>
<td>V001382</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP PARTY</td>
<td>V001383</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFORM PARTY</td>
<td>V001384</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* "b" variable for VT01 incumbent ind. Hse candidate
** "b" variable for VA05 incumbent ind. Hse candidate

SERVICES/SPENDING G11, CRIME K12

FTF = 7PT SCALE
PHONE = BRANCHING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G11 Services/spending</th>
<th>SELF</th>
<th>DEM HSE*</th>
<th>REP HSE*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. FTF</td>
<td>V001385</td>
<td>V001391a,b</td>
<td>V001397a,b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. PHONE</td>
<td>V001386</td>
<td>V001392a,b</td>
<td>V001398a,b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PHONE FOLLOWUPS</td>
<td>V001387-89</td>
<td>V001393a,b-1395a,b</td>
<td>V001399a,b-1401a,b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. FTF &amp; PHONE 7PT SUMM</td>
<td>V001390</td>
<td>V001396a,b</td>
<td>V001402a,b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

K12 Crime
1. FTF                    | V001482 |

2. PHONE                    V001482a
3. PHONE FOLLOWUPS          V001483-85
4. FTF & PHONE 7PT SUMM     V001486

* "b" variable for VT01 incumbent ind. Hse candidate
** "b" variable for VA05 incumbent ind. Hse candidate

>> 2000 PROCESSING INFORMATION

The data collection was processed according to standard 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. Annotation was added by the processors for explanatory purposes.

>> 2000 VARIABLE DESCRIPTION LIST

F = FACE-TO-FACE      S = STANDARD FORMAT         R = SCALE RATING OR FOLLOWUP
T = TELEPHONE         E = EXPERIMENTAL FORMAT     B = BRANCHING SERIES

Note:
The list of 'subsample' variables does not include those corresponding to questions administered to a random selection of cases as part of a split sample; in the latter, no systematic difference by mode or format exists among respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FULL SAMPLE</th>
<th>SUB-SAMPLE VAR AND</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDENTIFICATION AND WEIGHTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VVERSION</td>
<td>Process.1. ANES VERSION NUMBER OF DATA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDSETNO</td>
<td>Process.2. ANES DATASET NUMBER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICPSRNO</td>
<td>Process.2a. ICPSR ARCHIVE NUMBER 3131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V000001</td>
<td>Process.4. Case ID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V000001a</td>
<td>Process.4a. Post ID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V000002</td>
<td>Process.5. Sample weight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V000002a</td>
<td>Process.5a. Post weight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V000003</td>
<td>Process.6. Pre only or Pre-and-Post interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRE ADMINISTRATIVE AND FIELD VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FULL SAMPLE</th>
<th>SUB-SAMPLE VAR AND</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

V000004  Pre/Admin.1. Mode of Pre IW
V000005a  Pre/Admin.2a. Form - E section
V000005b  Pre/Admin.2b. Form - F6-F9 half sample
V000005c  Pre/Admin.2c. Form - Q1-Q11 or Q14-15
V000005d  Pre/Admin.2d. Form - G section lib-con
V000005e  Pre/Admin.2e. Form - H1 or H1.E

V000005f  Pre.Admin.2f. Form - H2 or H2.E
V000005g  Pre.Admin.2g. Form - H4 or H4.E
V000005h  Pre.Admin.2h. Form - H11 or H11.E
V000005j  Pre.Admin.2j. Form - H12 or H12.E
V000005k  Pre.Admin.2k. Form - L3 medical insur.
V000005m  Pre.Admin.2m. Form - L6 or L6.E
V000005n  Pre.Admin.2n. Form - M4 env vs. jobs
V000005p  Pre.Admin.2p. Form - N1 or N1.E
V000005q  Pre.Admin.2q. Form - P1 women's role
V000006   Pre/Admin.3. Month of IW
V000007   Pre/Admin.4. Day of IW
V000008   Pre/Admin.5. Month and day (MMDD)
V000009   Pre/Admin.6. No. days after election
V000010   Pre/Admin.7. IW length
V000011   Pre/Admin.8. IW number
V000012   Pre/Admin.9. Date of beginning VQ file
V000013   Pre/Admin.10. Date of ending VQ file
V000014   Pre/Admin.11. Flag- change in VQ
V000015   Pre/Admin.12. Advance letter sent?
V000016   Pre/Admin.13. Payment amount
V000017   Pre/Admin.14. Payment mode
V000018   Pre/Admin.15. Payment date
V000019   Pre/Admin.16. Tape recorded?
V000020   Pre/Admin.17. Verification
V000021   Pre/Admin.18. Evaluation
V000022   Pre/Admin.19. Conversion indicator
V000023   Pre/Admin.20. Persuasion letter
V000024   Pre/Admin.21. Date per letter requested
V000025   Pre/Admin.22. Date persuasion sent
V000026   Pre/Admin.23. Type of persuasion letter
V000027   Pre/Admin.24. Telephone calls
V000028   Pre/Admin.25. FTF calls
V000029   Pre/Admin.26. Final result
V000030   Pre/Admin.27. Sample release (all 1)
V000031   Pre/Admin.28. Lang of IW (all English)

PRE COVERSHEET VARIABLES
------------------------------------------------------------------
V000032   Pre.CSheet.1. Flag- missing CS
V000033   Pre.CSheet.2. Color of coversheet
V000034   T  Pre.CSheet.3. PH- type phone #
V000035   T  Pre.CSheet.4. PH- business with residence
V000036   T  Pre.CSheet.5. PH- bus res has personal#
V000037   F  Pre.CSheet.6. FTF- HH listing from
V000038   Pre.CSheet.7. Selection table
V000039   Pre.CSheet.8. Number of elig adults
V000040   Pre.CSheet.9. Number inelig adults
V000041   Pre.CSheet.10. Household composition
V000042   Pre.CSheet.11. R person number
V000043   F  Pre.CSheet.12. FTF- type structure
V000044   F  Pre.CSheet.13. FTF- gatekeeper
V000045   F  Pre.CSheet.14. FTF- type gatekeeper
V000046   Pre.CSheet.15. Resistance from contact?
V000047   Pre.CSheet.16. Contact resist-waste time
V000048   Pre.CSheet.17. Contact resist-too personal
V000049   Pre.CSheet.18. Contact resist-confidentiality
V000050   Pre.CSheet.19. Contact resist-not interested politics
V000051   Pre.CSheet.20. Contact resist-too busy
V000052   Pre.CSheet.21. Contact resist-health
V000053 Pre.CSheet.22. Contact resist-other
V000054 Pre.CSheet.23. R refuse initially?
V000055 Pre.CSheet.24. R break appointments
V000056 Pre.CSheet.25. Was R contact resister?
V000057 Pre.CSheet.26. SUMMARY: did R resist
V000058 Pre.CSheet.27. R resist-waste time
V000059 Pre.CSheet.28. R resist-too personal
V000060 Pre.CSheet.29. R resist-confidentiality
V000061 Pre.CSheet.30. R resist-not interested in politics
V000062 Pre.CSheet.31. R resist-too busy
V000063 Pre.CSheet.32. R resist-health
V000064 Pre.CSheet.33. R resist-other
V000065 T Pre.CSheet.34. IWR est income (CSMS)
V000066 T Pre.CSheet.35. IWR est race (CSMS)
V000067 T Pre.CSheet.36. Certainty of race (CSMS)
V000068 T Pre.CSheet.37. Hispanic HH? (CSMS)
V000069 T Pre.CSheet.38. Certainty if Hisp (CSMS)

PRE INTERVIEWER VARIABLES
----------------------------------------
V000070 Pre.IWR.1. Interviewer of record
V000071 Pre.IWR.2. Supervisor
V000072 Pre.IWR.3. Interviewer gender
V000073 Pre.IWR.4. Interviewer education
V000074 Pre.IWR.5. Interviewer race
V000075 Pre.IWR.6. Interviewer ethnicity
V000076 Pre.IWR.7. Interviewer languages
V000077 Pre.IWR.8. Yrs Interviewer experience
V000078 Pre.IWR.9. Interviewer age (bracketed)

PRE - SAMPLING INFORMATION
----------------------------------------
V000079 Pre.Sample.1. ICPSR state code
V000080 Pre.Sample.2. FIPS state code
V000081 Pre.Sample.3. 2000 state abbr and CD
V000082 Pre.Sample.4. 2000 FIPS state and CD
V000083 Pre.Sample.5. Congressional district no.
V000084 Pre.Sample.6. ICPSR state and CD
V000085 Pre.Sample.7. Did R vote outside IW CD?
V000086 Pre.Sample.8. State/CD -vote outside CD
V000087 F Pre.Sample.9. FIPS state and county
V000087a F Pre.Sample.9a. County (alpha)
V000088 F Pre.Sample.10. Primary area name
V000089 F Pre.Sample.11. Primary area code
V000090 F Pre.Sample.12. Segment number (blanked)
V000090a F Pre.Sample.13. Segment name (blanked)
V000091 F Pre.Sample.14. Number of HH units
V000092 F Pre.Sample.15. Census region
V000093 F Pre.Sample.16. Belt code
V000094 F Pre.Sample.17. Population in 1000s
V000095 F Pre.Sample.18. Census size of place
V000096 F Pre.Sample.19. Census tract/ed indicator
V000097 F Pre.Sample.20. 2000 Sampling Error code
V000098 F Pre.Sample.21. 2000 Census NECMA/SMSA
V000099 F Pre.Sample.22. 2000 CMSA
V000100 F Pre.Sample.23. 2000 Census Tract 1
V000101 F Pre.Sample.24. 2000 Census Tract 2
V000102 F Pre.Sample.25. 2000 Block 1
V000103  F  Pre.Sample.26. 2000 Block 2
V000104  F  Pre.Sample.27. 2000 MCD
V000105  F  Pre.Sample.28. 2000 CDP
V000106  F  Pre.Sample.29. 2000 FIPS place code

PRE SUMMARY DESCRIPTIONS/CALCULATIONS
-----------------------------------------------
V000107  Pre.Summary.1. Pre timing - section A
V000108  Pre.Summary.2. Pre timing - section B
V000109  Pre.Summary.3. Pre timing - section C
V000110  Pre.Summary.4. Pre timing - section D
V000111  Pre.Summary.5. Pre timing - section E
V000112  Pre.Summary.6. Pre timing - section F
V000113  Pre.Summary.7. Pre timing - section G
V000114  Pre.Summary.8. Pre timing - section H
V000115  Pre.Summary.9. Pre timing - section K
V000116  Pre.Summary.10. Pre timing - section L
V000117  Pre.Summary.11. Pre timing - section M
V000118  Pre.Summary.12. Pre timing - section N
V000119  Pre.Summary.13. Pre timing - section P
V000120  Pre.Summary.14. Pre timing - section Q
V000121  Pre.Summary.15. Pre timing - section R
V000122  Pre.Summary.16. Pre timing - section S
V000123  Pre.Summary.17. Pre timing - section X
V000124  Pre.Summary.18. Pre timing - section Y
V000125  Pre.Summary.19. Pre timing - section Z

POST ADMINISTRATIVE AND FIELD VARIABLES
-----------------------------------------------
V000126  Post.Admin.1. Mode of Interview
V000127a Post.Admin.2a. Form desc 1 - H in Post
V000127b Post.Admin.2b. Form desc 2 - K format
V000128  Post.Admin.3. Mo. IW
V000129  Post/Admin.4. Day IW
V000130  Post/Admin.5. Month and day (MMDD)
V000131  Post/Admin.6. No. days after election
V000132  Post/Admin.7. IW bef/aft Gore concession
V000133  Post/Admin.8. IW length
V000134  Post/Admin.9. IW no.
V000135  Post/Admin.10. Date of beg VQ file
V000136  Post/Admin.11. Date of end VQ file
V000137  Post/Admin.12. Flag- change in VQ
V000138  Post/Admin.13. Release
V000139  Post/Admin.14. Payment amt
V000140  Post/Admin.15. Payment mode
V000141  Post/Admin.16. Payment date
V000142  Post/Admin.17. Tape recorded
V000143  Post/Admin.18. Verification
V000144  Post/Admin.19. Evaluation
V000145  Post/Admin.20. Conversion ind.
V000146  Post/Admin.21. Persuasion letter
V000147  Post/Admin.22. Date requested
V000148  Post/Admin.23. Date sent
V000149  Post/Admin.24. Type letter
V000150  Post/Admin.25. Tel calls
V000151  Post/Admin.26. FTF calls
V000152  Post/Admin.27. Final result
V000153  Post/Admin.28. Result date (NI)
V000154 Post.Admin. 29. Flag - mode switch
V000155 Post.Admin. 30. Lang of IW (all English)

POST COVERSHEET VARIABLES
-------------------------------
V000156 Post.CSheet. 1. Flag - missing CS
V000157 Post.CSheet. 2. Color of coversheet
V000158 Post.CSheet. 3. Item 1. R at samp addr
V000159 T Post.CSheet. 4. Item 2b. PHONE: New phone
V000160 F Post.CSheet. 5. Item 2b. FTF: Addr status
V000161 F Post.CSheet. 6. FTF type structure
V000162 F Post.CSheet. 7. FTF gatekeeper
V000163 F Post.CSheet. 8. FTF type gatekeeper
V000164 Post.CSheet. 9. Resist from contact
V000165 Post.CSheet. 10. Contct resist - waste time
V000166 Post.CSheet. 11. Contct resist - too personal
V000167 Post.CSheet. 12. Contct resist - confidentiality
V000168 Post.CSheet. 13. Contct resist - not interested politics
V000170 Post.CSheet. 15. Contct resist - health
V000171 Post.CSheet. 16. Contct resist - other
V000172 Post.CSheet. 17. R refuse initially
V000173 Post.CSheet. 18. R break appts
V000174 Post.CSheet. 19. Was R contact resister?
V000175 Post.CSheet. 20. SUMMARY: did R resist
V000176 Post.CSheet. 21. R resist - waste time
V000177 Post.CSheet. 22. R resist - too personal
V000178 Post.CSheet. 23. R resist - confidentiality
V000179 Post.CSheet. 24. R resist - not interested politics
V000180 Post.CSheet. 25. R resist - too busy
V000181 Post.CSheet. 26. R resist - health
V000182 Post.CSheet. 27. R resist - other
V000183 Post.CSheet. 28. Ever make contact (NI)
V000184 Post.CSheet. 29. Reason no contact (NI)
V000184a F Post.CSheet. 30. CSMS estimated income
V000184b F Post.CSheet. 31. CSMS estimated HH race
V000184c F Post.CSheet. 32. CSMS est HH race certain
V000184d F Post.CSheet. 33. CSMS estimated Hispanic
V000184e F Post.CSheet. 34. CSMS est Hispanic certain

POST INTERVIEWER VARIABLES
-----------------------------
V000185 Post.IWR. 1. Interviewer of record
V000186 Post.IWR. 2. Supervisor
V000187 Post.IWR. 3. Interviewer gender
V000188 Post.IWR. 4. Interviewer education
V000189 Post.IWR. 5. Interviewer race
V000190 Post.IWR. 6. Interviewer ethnicity
V000191 Post.IWR. 7. Interviewer languages
V000192 Post.IWR. 8. Yrs Interviewer experience
V000193 Post.IWR. 9. Interviewer age (bracketed)

POST - CANDIDATE AND TYPE RACE INFORMATION
---------------------------------------------
V000194 Post.Cand. 1. House race type
V000194a Post.Cand. 1a. Retiring House Repr name
V000194b Post.Cand. 1b. Retiring House Repr code
V000194c Post.Cand.1c. Retiring House Repr gender
V000194d Post.Cand.1d. Winner of 2000 House election
V000194e Post.Cand.1e. Winner of 2000 Senate election
V000194g Post.Cand.1g. Open seat in 2000 election
V000195 Post.Cand.2. House Democratic cand name
V000196 Post.Cand.3. House Democratic cand code
V000197 Post.Cand.4. House Democratic cand gendr
V000198 Post.Cand.5. House Republican cand name
V000199 Post.Cand.6. House Republican cand code
V000200 Post.Cand.7. House Republican cand gendr
V000201 Post.Cand.8. House Ind cand name
V000202 Post.Cand.9. House Ind cand code
V000202a Post.Cand.9a. House Ind cand party
V000203 Post.Cand.10. House Ind cand gender
V000204 Post.Cand.11. Senate race type
V000205 Post.Cand.12. Senate Democr cand name
V000206 Post.Cand.13. Senate Democr cand code
V000208 Post.Cand.15. Senate Repub cand name
V000209 Post.Cand.16. Senate Repub cand code
V000210 Post.Cand.17. Senate Repub cand gender
V000211 Post.Cand.18. Senate Ind 1 cand name
V000212 Post.Cand.19. Senate Ind 1 cand code
V000212a Post.Cand.19a. Senate Ind 1 cand party
V000213 Post.Cand.20. Senate Ind 1 cand gender
V000214 Post.Cand.21. Senate Ind 2 cand name
V000215 Post.Cand.22. Senate Ind 2 cand code
V000215a Post.Cand.22a. Senate Ind 2 cand party
V000216 Post.Cand.23. Senate Ind 2 cand gender
V000217 Post.Cand.24. Outside Hse Dem cand name
V000218 Post.Cand.25. Outside Hse Dem cand code
V000220 Post.Cand.27. Outside Hse Rep cand name
V000221 Post.Cand.28. Outside Hse Rep cand code
V000222 Post.Cand.29. Outside Hse Rep cand gendr
V000223 Post.Cand.30. Outside Hse Ind cand name
V000224 Post.Cand.31. Outside Hse Ind cand code
V000225 Post.Cand.32. Outside Hse Ind cand gendr
V000226 Post.Cand.33. Outside Hse race type
V000226a Post.Cand.33a. Outside Sen race type
V000227 Post.Cand.34. Outside Sen Democr cand name
V000228 Post.Cand.35. Outside Sen Democr cand code
V000229 Post.Cand.36. Outside Sen Democr cand gendr
V000230 Post.Cand.37. Outside Sen Rep cand name
V000231 Post.Cand.38. Outside Sen Rep cand code
V000233 Post.Cand.40. Outside Sen Ind1 cand name
V000234 Post.Cand.41. Outside Sen Ind1 cand code
V000235 Post.Cand.42. Outside Sen Ind1 cand gender
V000236 Post.Cand.43. Outside Sen Ind2 cand name
V000237 Post.Cand.44. Outside Sen Ind2 cand code
V000238 Post.Cand.45. Outside Sen Ind2 cand gender

POST SUMMARY DESCRIPTIONS/CALCULATIONS

V000239 Post.Summary.1. Post timing - section A
V000240 Post.Summary.2. Post timing - section B
V000241 Post.Summary.3. Post timing - section C
A1-A2 - CURRENT CAMPAIGN/ELECTION

V000301 A1. Attention R paid to campaigns
V000302 A2. Does R care about Pres election

A3 - LAST PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

V000303 A3. Did R vote in 1996 election
V000304 A3a. Who did R vote for in 1996

A4-A5 - PRES. CAND LIKES-DISLIKES

V000305 A4a. Does R like anything about Gore
V000306 A4b(1). #1 detail about Gore R likes
V000307 A4b(2). #2 detail about Gore R likes
V000308 A4b(3). #3 detail about Gore R likes
V000309 A4b(4). #4 detail about Gore R likes
V000310 A4b(5). #5 detail about Gore R likes
V000311 A4c. Does R dislike anything about Gore
V000312 A4d(1). #1 detail about Gore R dislikes
V000313 A4d(2). #2 detail about Gore R dislikes
V000314 A4d(3). #3 detail about Gore R dislikes
V000315 A4d(4). #4 detail about Gore R dislikes
V000316 A4d(5). #5 detail about Gore R dislikes

V000317 A5a. Does R like anything about Bush
V000318 A5b(1). #1 detail about Bush R likes
V000319 A5b(2). #2 detail about Bush R likes
V000320 A5b(3). #3 detail about Bush R likes
V000321 A5b(4). #4 detail about Bush R likes
V000322 A5b(5). #5 detail about Bush R likes
V000323 A5c. Does R dislike anything about Bush
V000324 A5d(1). #1 detail about Bush R dislikes
V000325 A5d(2). #2 detail about Bush R dislikes
V000326 A5d(3). #3 detail about Bush R dislikes
V000327 A5d(4). #4 detail about Bush R dislikes
A5d(5). #5 detail about Bush R dislikes

A6-A11 - MEDIA

A6. Number of days R watched nat'l news
A6a/A6a.T. Attention to national news
A7. Days R watched early local news
A8. Days R watched late local news
A8a/A8a.T. Attention to local news
A9. Does R have cable or satellite tv?
A10. Days R read a daily newspaper
A10a. Did R read about campaign in paper
A10b/A10b.T. Attention to newspaper articles
A11. Did R see ads for candidates on tv

A12 - PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL

A12. Approve/disappr Clinton job
A12a. Strength of approval/disapproval of Clinton
A12x. Summary app/disapp Clinton job

B1-B2 - CANDIDATE RECALL

B1. Did R care about House election
B2. Does R remember names of House candidates
B2a. #1 recalled name, House cand
B2al. #1 recall party, House cand
B2ax1. #1 House cand recall-actual party
B2ax2. #1 House cand recall- accuracy
B2b. #2 recalled name, House cand
B2bl. #2 recall party, House cand
B2bx1. #2 House cand recall-actual party
B2bx2. #2 House cand recall- accuracy
B2c. #3 recalled name, House cand
B2cl. #3 recall party, House cand
B2cx1. #3 House cand recall-actual party
B2cx2. #3 House cand recall-accuracy

B3 - CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL

B3. Congress job approve/dissappr
B3a. Strength of approval/disapproval of Cong
B3x. Summary R approval of US Congress

C1-C2 - THERMOMETERS

C1a/C1a.T. Thermometer Bill Clinton
C1b/C1b.T. Thermometer Gore
C1c/C1c.T. Thermometer George W Bush
C1d/C1d.T. Thermometer Buchanan
C1e/C1e.T. Thermometer Nader
C1f/C1f.T. Thermometer Mccain
C1g/C1g.T. Thermometer Bradley
C1h/C1h.T. Thermometer Lieberman
C1j/C1j.T. Thermometer Cheney
V000368  C1k/C1k.T. Thermometer Hillary Clinton
V000369  C2a. Thermometer Dem Party
V000370  C2b. Thermometer Rep Party
V000371  C2c. Thermometer Reform Party
V000372  C2d. Thermometer parties in general

D1-D4 - PARTY LIKES-DISLIKES
----------------------------------

V000373  D1. Like anything- Dem Party
V000374  D1a(1). #1 like Dem Party
V000375  D1a(2). #2 like Dem Party
V000376  D1a(3). #3 like Dem Party
V000377  D1a(4). #4 like Dem Party
V000378  D1a(5). #5 like Dem Party
V000379  D2. Dislike anything- Dem Party
V000380  D2a(1). #1 dislike Dem Party
V000381  D2a(2). #2 dislike Dem Party
V000382  D2a(3). #3 dislike Dem Party
V000383  D2a(4). #4 dislike Dem Party
V000384  D2a(5). #5 dislike Dem Party
V000385  D3. Like anything- Rep Party
V000386  D3a(1). #1 like Rep Party
V000387  D3a(2). #2 like Rep Party
V000388  D3a(3). #3 like Rep Party
V000389  D3a(4). #4 like Rep Party
V000390  D3a(5). #5 like Rep Party
V000391  D4. Dislike anything- Rep Party
V000392  D4a(1). #1 dislike Rep Party
V000393  D4a(2). #2 dislike Rep Party
V000394  D4a(3). #3 dislike Rep Party
V000395  D4a(4). #4 dislike Rep Party
V000396  D4a(5). #5 dislike Rep Party

D5 - PARTY CONTROL
----------------------------------

V000397  D5. Preference for divided government

E1-E3 - R FINANCIAL SITUATION
----------------------------------

V000398  E1/E1.T. Better/worse off in last year
V000399  Ela. How much better off- last year
V000400  Elb. How much worse off- last year
V000401  E1x. Summary R econ situation last year
V000402  E2/E2.T. Did R delay med/dent treatment
V000403  E3/E3.T. Expect better/worse in next year
V000404  E3a. How much better off- next year
V000405  E3b. How much worse off- next year
V000406  E3x. Summary R econ situation next year

F1-F3 - PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE AFFECTS
----------------------------------

V000407  Fla. Angry- Gore affect
V000408  Flaa. Angry- how often Gore affect
V000409  Flb. Hopeful- Gore affect
V000410  Flbb. Hopeful- how often Gore affect
V000411  Flc. Afraid- Gore affect
V000412 F1cc. Afraid- how often Gore affect
V000413 F1d. Proud- Gore affect
V000414 F1dd. Proud- how often Gore affect
V000415 F2a. Angry- Bush affect
V000416 F2aa. Angry- how often Bush affect
V000417 F2b. Hopeful- Bush affect
V000418 F2bb. Hopeful- how often Bush affect
V000419 F2c. Afraid- Bush affect
V000420 F2cc. Afraid- how often Bush affect
V000421 F2d. Proud- Bush affect
V000422 F2dd. Proud- how often Bush affect
V000423 F3a. Angry- Buchanan affect
V000424 F3aa. Angry- how often Buchanan affect
V000425 F3b. Hopeful- Buchanan affect
V000426 F3bb. Hopeful- how often Buchanan affect
V000427 F3c. Afraid- Buchanan affect
V000428 F3cc. Afraid- how often Buchanan affect
V000429 F3d. Proud- Buchanan affect
V000430 F3dd. Proud- how often Buchanan affect

F6-F9 - MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM(S)
-----------------------------------------------
V000431 F6(1). #1 most important problem
V000432 F6(2). #2 most important problem
V000433 F6(3). #3 most important problem
V000434 F6(4). #4 most important problem
V000435 F6x. Checkpoint for # of mentions
V000436 F7. Choice - most important problem
V000437 F8. Gov't performance on most imp problem
V000438 F9. Party performance on most imp problem

G1-G10 - LIBERAL-CONSERVATIVE
-----------------------------------------------
V000439 FSR Glia. Self placement lib-con scale
V000439a TSR Glia.T. Self placement lib-con scale phone
V000440 SR Glax. Summary: combined FTF/ph
V000441 SR G1b. Had to choose lib-con self-placemt
V000441a SR G1bx. Summary: comb FTF/phone-lib-con
V000442 EB G6.E. Self placement lib-con branching
V000443 EB G6a.E. Had to choose lib-con branching
V000444 EB G6b.E. R strong liberal or not
V000445 EB G6c.E. R strong conservative or not
V000446 G6x1. Summary self plcmnt lib-con scale/brnch
V000447 G6x2. Comb.7pt & branching summ

V000448 FSR G2. Clinton placement lib-con scale FTF
V000448a TSR G2.T. Clinton plcmnt lib-con scale phone
V000449 SR G2x. Combined FTF/ph Clinton lib-con
V000450 EB G7.E. Clinton placement lib-con branch
V000451 EB G7a.E. Clinton strong liberal or not
V000452 EB G7b.E. Clinton strong conservtive or not
V000453 EB G7x1.E. 5-pt br summary Clinton lib-con
V000454 G7x2. Comb.7pt/br summ Clinton lib-con

V000455 FSR G3. Gore placement lib-con scale FTF
V000455a TSR G3.T. Gore placement lib-con scale phone
V000456 SR G3x. Combined FTF/ph Gore lib-con scale
V000457 FSR G3a. Gore-certain lib-con placement FTF
V000458  TSR  G3a.T. Gore-certain lib-con plcmnt phone
V000458a               G3ax.T. Comb. Gore-certain lib-con plcmnt
V000459   EB  G8.E. Gore placement lib-con branch
V000460   EB  G8a.E. Gore strong liberal or not
V000461   EB  G8b.E. Gore strong conservative or not
V000462   EB  G8x1.E. 5-pt br summary Gore lib-con
V000463       G8x2. Comb.7pt/br summ Gore lib-con
V000464   EB  G8c.E. Gore-certain lib-con placement br
V000464a                G8cx 7pt/branching summary Gore crtn l-c
---------------------------------------------------------------------
V000465  FSR  G4. Bush placement lib-con scale FTF
V000465a TSR  G4.T. Bush placement lib-con scale phone
V000466   SR  G4x. Combined FTF/ph Bush lib-con scale
V000467   FSR  G4a. Bush-certain lib-con placement FTF
V000468   TSR  G4a.T. Bush-certain plcmnt lib-con phone
V000468a              G4ax.T. Comb. Bush-certain plcmnt lib-con
V000469   EB  G9.E. Bush placement lib-con branch
V000470   EB  G9a.E. Bush strong liberal or not
V000471   EB  G9b.E. Bush strong conservative or not
V000472   EB  G9x1.E. 5-pt br summary Bush lib-con
V000473       G9x2. Comb.7pt/br summ Bush lib-con
V000474   EB  G9c.E. Bush-certain lib-con placement br
V000474a                G9cx 7pt/branching summary Bush crtn l-c
---------------------------------------------------------------------
V000475  FSR  G5. Buchanan placement lib-con scale FTF
V000475a TSR  G5.T. Buchan plcmnt lib-con scale phon
V000476   SR  G5x. Combined FTF/ph Buchan lib-con scl
V000477   FSR  G5a. Buchanan-crtnt lib-con plcmnt FTF
V000478   TSR  G5a.T. Buchanan-crtnt lib-con plcmnt phone
V000478a              G5ax.T. Combined Buchanan-certain lib-con plcmnt
V000479   EB  G10.E. Buchanan placement lib-con branch
V000480   EB  G10a.E. Buchanan strong liberal or not
V000481   EB  G10b.E. Buchanan strong conserv or not
V000482   EB  G10x1.E. 5-pt br summary Buchanan lib-con
V000483       G10x2. Comb.7pt/br summ Buchanan lib-con
V000484   EB  G10c.E. Certain-Buchan plcmnt lib-con br
V000484a                G10cx. 7pt/branching summ Buchanan l-c crt

G11 - ANTICIPATED OUTCOME OF NOVEMBER ELECTION
---------------------------------------------------------------------
V000485
V000486
V000487
H1-H4 - NATIONAL ECONOMY
---------------------------------------------------------------------
V000488a S  H1. US econ bttr/worse in last year stan
V000488b E  H1.E. US econ bttr/worse in last year ex
V000489   H1a. How much better US econ last year
V000490   H1b. How much worse US econ last year
V000491   H1x. Summary US econ btr/worse last year
V000492a S  H2. Esr/hrdr to find work last year stan
V000492b E  H2.E. Esr/hrdr to find work last year ex
V000493   H2a. How much harder to find work 1st yr
V000494   H2b. How much easier to find work 1st yr
V000495   H2x. Summary employ opps in last year
V000496a S  H4. US econ bttr/worse in next year stan
V000496b E  H4.E. US econ bttr/worse in next year ex
H4a. How much better US econ in nxt year
H4b. How much worse US econ in nxt year
H4x. Summary US econ in next year

H5 - APPROVE PRESIDENT HANDLING OF ECONOMY
------------------------------------------------------

H5. Approve/dissap Clinton w/economy
H5a. How much approve Clinton w/economy
H5b. How much dissprv Clinton w/economy
H5x. Summary Clinton w/economy
H6. Is R invested in stock market

H7-H8 - PARTY PERFORMANCE
------------------------------------------------------

H7. Which party R thinks best to handle econ
H8. Which party R thinks would avoid war

H9-H12 - NATION : STRENGTH, IMMIGRATION, IMPORTS, ISOLATION
------------------------------------------------------

H9. Us position in world weaker/stronger
H10. Increase/decrease immigratration
H10a. Inc/dec immigrtn little or a lot
H10x. Summary immigration level
H11. Favor/oppose import limits stan
V000511a S H11. Favor/oppose import limits ex
V000511b E H11.E. Favor/oppp import limits ex
H11x. Combined versions import limits
V000512a S H12. US better off to stay at home stan
V000512b E H12.E. US better off to stay at home ex
V000514a S H12x. Combined versions isolationism

H13 - APPROVE PRESIDENT HANDLING OF FOREIGN RELATIONS
------------------------------------------------------

H13. Clinton foreign rel approve/disappr
H13a. Strength approve Clinton frgn rel
H13b. Strength dissappr Clinton frgn rel
H13x. Summary Clinton foreign relations

K1 - PARTY ID
------------------------------------------------------

K1. Does R consider self Rep Dem or Ind
K1a. Is R a strong Democrat or not
K1b. Is R a strong Republican or not
K1c. Is R closer to Rep or Dem Party
K1x. Party ID summary

K2-K4 - PRES. CANDIDATE TRAITS
------------------------------------------------------

K2a. Gore trait - moral
K2b. Gore trait - really cares
K2c. Gore trait - knowledgeable
K2d. Gore trait - strong leader
K2e. Gore trait - dishonest
K2f. Gore trait - intelligent
| V000530 | K2g. Gore trait - out of touch |
| V000531 | K3a. Bush trait - moral |
| V000532 | K3b. Bush trait - really cares |
| V000533 | K3c. Bush trait - knowledgeable |
| V000534 | K3d. Bush trait - strong leader |
| V000535 | K3e. Bush trait - dishonest |
| V000536 | K3f. Bush trait - intelligent |
| V000537 | K3g. Bush trait - out of touch |
| V000538 | K4a. Buchanan trait - moral |
| V000539 | K4b. Buchanan trait - really cares |
| V000540 | K4c. Buchanan trait - knowledgeable |
| V000541 | K4d. Buchanan trait - strong leader |
| V000542 | K4e. Buchanan trait - dishonest |
| V000543 | K4f. Buchanan trait - intelligent |
| V000544 | K4g. Buchanan trait - out of touch |

L1 - SERVICES/SPENDING TRADEOFF

| V000545 FR | L1a. Self plcmnt-services/spend scl FTF |
| V000546 TB | L1a.T. Self plcmnt-services/spend scl phone |
| V000547 TB | L1a1.T. How much reduce serv/spend phone |
| V000548 TB | L1a2.T. How much incr serv/spend phone |
| V000549 TB | L1ax1. 5-pt br summary of self on serv/spend |
| V000550 | L1ax2. Comb.7pt/br summ of self on serv/spend |

| V000551 FR | L1b. Clinton- serv/spend scale FTF |
| V000552 TB | L1b.T. Clinton- serve/spend scale phone |
| V000553 TB | L1b1.T. Clinton- how much red serv/spd ph |
| V000554 TB | L1b2.T. Clinton- how much inc serv/spd ph |
| V000555 TB | L1bx1. 5-pt br summary Clinton srv/spnd |
| V000556 | L1bx2. Comb.7pt/br summ Clinton srv/spnd |

| V000557 FR | L1c. Gore- serv/spend scale FTF |
| V000558 TB | L1c.T. Gore- serv/spend scale phone |
| V000559 TB | L1c1.T. Gore- how much red serv/spend ph |
| V000560 TB | L1c2.T. Gore- how much inc serv/spend ph |
| V000561 TB | L1cx1. 5-pt br summary Gore serv/spend |
| V000562 | L1cx2. Comb.7pt/br summ Gore serv/spend |

| V000563 FR | L1d. Bush- serv/spend scale FTF |
| V000564 TB | L1d.T. Bush- serv/spend scale phone |
| V000565 TB | L1d1.T. Bush- how much reduce serv/spend ph |
| V000566 TB | L1d2.T. Bush- how much increase serv/spend ph |
| V000567 TB | L1dx1. 5-pt br summary Bush serv/spend |
| V000568 | L1dx2. Comb.7pt/br summ Bush serv/spend |

| V000569 FR | L1e. Dem Party- serv/spend scale FTF |
| V000570 TB | L1e.T. Dem Party- serv/spend scale phone |
| V000571 TB | L1e1.T. Dem Party- how much red srv/sp sp |
| V000572 TB | L1e2.T. Dem Party- how much inc srv/sp ph |
| V000573 TB | L1ex1. 5-pt br summary Dem Party srv/spd |
| V000574 | L1ex2. Comb.7pt/br summ Dem Party srv/sp |

| V000575 FR | L1f. Rep Party- serv/spend scale FTF |
| V000576 TB | L1f.T. Rep Party- serv/spend scale phone |
| V000577 TB | L1f1.T. Rep Party- how much red srv/sp ph |
| V000578 TB | L1f2.T. Rep Party- how much inc srv/sp ph |
| V000579 TB | L1fx1. 5-pt br summary Rep Party srv/spd |
| V000580 | L1fx2. Comb.7pt/br summ Rep Party srv/sp |
L2 - DEFENSE SPENDING

V000581 FR  L2a. Self plcemnt-def spending scale FTF
V000582 TB  L2a.T. Self plcemnt-def spending scale phone
V000583 TB  L2a1.T. Govt inc/dec def spending phone
V000584 TB  L2a1a.T. How much reduce def spending ph
V000585 TB  L2a1b.T. How much increas def spending ph
V000586 TB  L2ax1. 5-pt br summary defense spending
V000587
L2ax2. Comb.7pt/br summ defense spending

V000588 FR  L2b. Gore- defense spending scale FTF
V000589 TB  L2b.T. Gore- defense spending scale ph
V000590 TB  L2b1.T. Gore-how much red/inc def spn ph
V000591 TB  L2bx1. 5-pt br summary Gore def spend
V000592
L2bx2. Comb.7pt/br summ Gore def spend

V000593 FR  L2c. Bush- defense spending scale FTF
V000594 TB  L2c.T. Bush- defense spending scale ph
V000595 TB  L2cl.T. Bush-how much red/inc def spd ph
V000596 TB  L2cx1. 5-pt br summary Bush def spend
V000597
L2cx2. Comb.7pt/br summ Bush def spend

V000598 FR  L2d. Dem Party- defense spending scale FTF
V000599 TB  L2d.T. Dem Party-def spend scale phone
V000600 TB  L2d1.T. Dem Party-how much red/inc ds ph
V000601 TB  L2dx1. 5-pt br summary Dem Party def sp
V000602
L2dx2. Comb.7pt/br summ Dem Party def sp

V000603 FR  L2e. Rep Party- defense spending scale FTF
V000604 TB  L2e.T. Rep Party-def spend scale phone
V000605 TB  L2e1.T. Rep Party-how much inc/red ds ph
V000606 TB  L2ex1. 5-pt br summary Rep Party def sp
V000607
L2ex2. Comb.7pt/br summ Rep Party def sp

L3 - GOVERNMENT MEDICAL INSURANCE

V000608
L3(1). Ckpt: FTF/ph, reg/exp.
V000608a FSR  L3a. Self placement-private or govt insur
V000608b FER  L3a.E. Self placement-insur scale FTF ex
V000609 FR  L3ax. Comb. FTF versions R insurnc scale
V000610a TSB  L3a.T. Self placement-insur scale phone stan
V000610b TEB  L3a.TE. Self placement-insur scale phone ex
V000611 TB  L3ax.TE. Comb. Ph versions R insur scale
V000612 TB  L3a1/a2.T. Strength of insurance plan
V000613 TB  L3x1. 5-pt br summary R on pri/govt insurance
V000614
L3x2. Comb.7pt/br summ of R on pri/govt insurance

L4 - GUARANTEED JOB/STANDARD OF LIVING

V000615 FR  L4a. R plcmnt-guar job/std liv scl FTF
V000616 TB  L4a.T. R plcmnt-guar job/std liv scl ph
V000617 TB  L4a1.T. How much should gov guar jobs
V000618 TB  L4a2t. How much should ppl get by on own
V000619 TB  L4x1. 5-pt br summary guaranteed jobs
V000620
L4x2. Comb.7pt/br summ guaranteed jobs
V000621 FR L4b. Gore-guar job/std liv scl FTF
V000622 TB L4b.T. Gore-guar job/std liv scl phone
V000623 TB L4b1/b2.T. Gore-strength of guar job
V000624 TB L4bx1. 5-pt br summary Gore guar job
V000625 TB L4bx2. Comb.7pt/br summ Gore guar job

V000626 FR L4c. Bush-guar job/std liv scl FTF
V000627 TB L4c.T. Bush-guar job/std liv scl phone
V000628 TB L4c1/c2.T. Bush-strength guar job
V000629 TB L4cx1. 5-pt br summary Bush guar job
V000630 TB L4cx2. Comb.7pt/br summ Bush guar job

V000631 FR L4d. Dem Party-guar job/std liv scl FTF
V000632 TB L4d.T. Dem Party-guar job/std liv scl ph
V000633 TB L4d1/d2.T. Dem Party-strength guar job
V000634 TB L4dx1. 5-pt br summary Dem Party guar job
V000635 TB L4dx2. Comb.7pt/br summ Dem Party gua job

V000636 FR L4e. Rep Party-guar job/std liv FTF
V000637 TB L4e.T. Rep Party-guar job/std liv phone
V000638 TB L4e1/e2.T. Rep Party-strength guar job
V000639 TB L4ex1. 5-pt br summary Rep Party guar job
V000640 TB L4ex2. Comb.7pt/br summ Rep Party guar job

L5 - AID TO BLACKS

V000641 FR L5a. R plcmnt-aid to blacks scale FTF
V000642 TB L5a.T. R plcmnt-aid to blacks scale phone
V000643 TB L5a1/a2.T. R-strength aid to blacks
V000644 TB L5ax1. 5-pt br summary R aid to blacks
V000645 TB L5ax2. Comb.7pt/br summ R aid to blacks

V000646 FR L5b. Clinton plcmnt-aid to blacks scale FTF
V000647 TB L5b.T. Clinton-aid to blacks scale phone
V000648 TB L5b1/b2.T. Clinton-strength aid to blacks
V000649 TB L5bx1. 5-pt br summary Clinton aid to blacks
V000650 TB L5bx2. Comb.7pt/br summ Clinton aid to blacks

V000651 FR L5c. Gore plcmnt-aid to blacks scale FTF
V000652 TB L5c.T. Gore-aid to blacks scale phone
V000653 TB L5c1/c2.T. Gore-strength aid to blacks
V000654 TB L5cx1. 5-pt br summary Gore aid to blks
V000655 TB L5cx2. Comb.7pt/br summ Gore aid to blks

V000656 FR L5d. Bush plcmnt-aid to blacks scale FTF
V000657 TB L5d.T. Bush-aid to blacks scale phone
V000658 TB L5d1/d2.T. Bush-strength aid to blacks
V000659 TB L5dx1. 5-pt br summary Bush aid to blks
V000660 TB L5dx2. Comb.7pt/br summ Bush aid to blks

V000661 FR L5e. Dem Party plcmnt-aid to blks scale FTF
V000662 TB L5e.T. Dem Party-aid to blks scale phone
V000663 TB L5e1/e2.T. Dem Party-strght aid to blks
V000664 TB L5ex1. 5-pt br summary Dem Party aid blks
V000665 TB L5ex2. Comb.7pt/br summ Dem Party aid blks

V000666 FR L5f. Rep Party plcmnt-aid to blks scale FTF
V000667 TB L5f.T. Rep Party-aid to blks scale phone
V000668 TB L5f1/f2.T. Rep Party-strght aid to blks
L6 - AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

V000671a S L6. Appr/disappr affirmative action stan
V000671b E L6.E. Appr/disappr affirmative action ex
V000672 L6a. Strength for affirmative action
V000673 L6b. Strength against affirmative action
V000674 L6x. Summary affirmative action (Standard & Experm)
V000674a L6x1. Summary -strength of feeling affirmative action

L7-L9 - FEDERAL BUDGET

V000675 L7a. Inc/dec build and repair highways
V000676 L7b. Inc/dec welfare programs
V000677 L7c. Inc/dec spending on aids research
V000678 L7d. Inc/dec foreign aid
V000679 L7e. Inc/dec food stamps
V000680 L7f. Inc/dec aid to poor people
V000681 L7g. Inc/dec Social Security
V000682 L7h. Inc/dec environmental protection
V000683 L7j. Inc/dec public schools
V000684 L7k. Inc/dec dealing with crime
V000685 L7m. Inc/dec child care
V000686 L7n. Inc/dec against illegal immigrants
V000687 L7p. Inc/dec aid to blacks
V000688 L8. App/dis using surplus for tax cuts
V000689 L8a/b. Strength app/dis tax cuts
V000690 L8x. Summary tax cuts from surplus
V000691 L9. App/dis surplus for Soc Sec medicare
V000692 L9a/b. Strength app/dis Soc Sec medicare
V000693 L9x. Summary surplus for Soc Sec medicare

M1-M3 - ABORTION

V000694 M1/M1.T. Abortion self-placement
V000695 M1a. Importance of abortion to R
V000696 M1b/M1b.T. Gore-abortion scale
V000697 M1b1. Gore-certain abortion placement
V000698 M1c/M1c.T. Bush-abortion scale
V000699 M1c1. Bush-certain abortion placement
V000700 M2. App/dis abortion parental consent
V000701 M2a. Strength abortion parental consent
V000702 M2x. Summary abortion parental consent
V000703 M3. Fav/oppose prtl-birth abortion ban
V000704 M3a/b. Strength fav/opp p-b abortion ban
V000705 M3x. Summary partial-birth abortion ban

M4 - PROTECT ENVIRONMENT

V000707a FSR M4a. R-jobs/envir scale FTF stan
V000707b FER M4a.E. R-jobs/envir scale FTF ex
V000708 FR M4ax. Comb. FTF versions jobs/envir
V000709a TSB M4a.T. R-jobs/envir br phone stan
M4 - JOBS/ENVIRONMENT
M4a. Telephone
M4b. Gore
M4c. Bush
M4x. Summary

M4a1/a2. Strength
M4ax1. 5-pt br summary
M4bx1. 5-pt br summary

M4b1/b2. Gore-strength
M4cx1. 5-pt br summary

M4b2. Gore-phone
M4bx2. Comb.7pt/br summ
M4cx2. Comb.7pt/br summ

M4c2. Bush-phone

M5 - HOMOSEXUALS IN THE ARMED FORCES
M5. Favor/oppose
M5a. Strength favor
M5b. Strength oppose
M5x. Summary

M6 - GUN CONTROL
M6a. Gun control scale
M6a1. Strength more
M6a2. Strength less
M6ax. Summary
M6b. Gore plcmnt
M6b1/b2. Gore-strength
M6bx. Summary
M6c. Bush plcmnt
M6c1/c2. Bush-strength
M6cx. Summary

N1 - SCHOOL VOUCHERS
N1. Favor/oppose
N1a/b. Strength
N1x. Combined
N1ax. Summary

N2 - ENGLISH AS OFFICIAL LANGUAGE
N2. Favor/oppose

N3 - SCHOOL INTEGRATION
N3. Interest in

### N3a. Fav/opp gov help school integration

#### N4 - ADOPTION BY HOMOSEXUALS

#### N5 - DEATH PENALTY

#### P1 - WOMEN'S ROLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V000753</td>
<td>Pla. R plcmnt equal role scale FTF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V000754a</td>
<td>FSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V000754b</td>
<td>FER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V000755</td>
<td>FR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V000756a</td>
<td>TSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V000756b</td>
<td>TEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V000757</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V000758</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V000759</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V000760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### P2 - ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V000771</td>
<td>P2a. self placmnt-envir regulation scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V000772</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V000773</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V000774</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V000775</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V000776</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V000777</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V000778</td>
<td>P2b. Gore placmnt-envir regulation scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V000779</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V000780</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V000781</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V000782</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V000783</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V000784</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V000785</td>
<td>P2c. Bush placemnt-envir regulation scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
P3 - TURNOUT/VOTE INTENT

P3. R expect to vote in Nov election
P3a. Who will R vote for President
P3b. Strength of preference for candidate
P3c. If R voted, who would R vote for President
P3d. Strength of preference for candidate

P4-P5 - ANTICIPATED PARTY CONTROL AFTER ELECTION

P4. Which party will control the House
P5. Which party will control the Senate

P6-P7 - FAIR AND PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT FOR BLACKS

P6. Interest in fair treatment in jobs
P6a. Govt should ensure Blacks eqtl tmtmt in jobs
P6a1. Strength blacks equal tmtmnt jobs
P6x. Summary blacks equal treatment jobs
P6b. Preferences for blacks in jobs
P6a. Strength for preference blks jobs
P6b. Strength against preference blks jobs
P7x. Summary preference for blacks jobs

Q1-Q11 - CLINTON LEGACY

(Rs were asked Clinton Legacy in either pre or post). For full sample see variables 1529a, 1595a, 1599a, 1603a, 1608a, 1612a 1616a, 1620a, 1624a, & 1628a.)

Q1. Budget deficit lg/sm since 1992
Q1a. Deficit much/somewhat smaller
Q1b. Deficit much/somewhat larger
Q1x. Summary budget deficit since 1992
Q2. Spending on poor inc/dec since 1992
Q2a. How much inc/dec aid to poor
Q2x. Summary assistance to poor
Q3. Economy better/worse compared to 1992
Q3a. Economy much/somewhat better
Q3b. Economy much/somewhat worse
Q3x. Summary economy since 1992
Q4. Clinton made economy better/worse
Q4a. Clinton made econ much/somewhat better
Q4b. Clinton made econ much/somewhat worse
Q4x. Summary Clinton effect on US econ
Q5. Clinton admin hurt/help R personally
Q6. U.S. more/less secure since 1992
Q6a. U.S. much more secure from enemies
Q6b. U.S much less secure from enemies
Q6x. Summary US secure from for enemies
Q7. Clinton made U.S. more/less secure
Q7a. Clinton made U.S. much/smewhat more secure
Q7b. Clinton made U.S. much/smewhat less secure
Q7x. Summ- Clinton impact on U.S. security
Q8. U.S. crime rate better/worse since 1992
Q8a. U.S. crime rate much/smewhat better
Q8b. U.S. crime rate much or smewhat worse
Q8x. Summary - U.S. crime rate since 1992
Q9. Clinton made crime rate better/worse
Q9a. Clinton made crime rate much/smewhat btr
Q9b. Clinton made crime rate much/smewhat wrse
Q9x. Summary - Clinton impact on crime rate
Q10. Moral climate btr/worse since 1992
Q10a. Moral climate much/smewhat better
Q10b. Moral climate much/smewhat worse
Q10x. Summary moral climate since 1992
Q11. Clinton made moral climate btr/worse
Q11a. Clinton made moral climate much/swht btr
Q11b. Clinton made moral climate much/swht wrse
Q11x. Summary - Clinton impact on moral climate

Q14 - CLINTON AFFECTS
(Rs were asked Clinton Affects in either pre or post. For full sample see variables 1629a, 1630a, 1631a, 1632a, 1633a, 1634a 1635a, 1636a.)

Q14a. Angry- Clinton affect
Q14a1. Angry- how oft Clinton affect
Q14b. Hopeful- Clinton affect
Q14b1. Hopeful- how oft Clinton affect
Q14c. Afraid- Clinton affect
Q14c1. Afraid- how often Clinton affect
Q14d. Proud- Clinton affect
Q14d1. Proud- how oft Clinton affect

Q15 - CLINTON TRAITS

Q15a/Q15a.T. Clinton trait-moral
Q15b/Q15b.T. Clinton trait-really cares
Q15c/Q15c.T. Clinton trait-knowledgeable
Q15d/Q15d.T. Clinton trait-strong leader
Q15e/Q15e.T. Clinton trait-dishonest
Q15f/Q15f.T. Clinton trait-intelligent
Q15g/Q15g.T. Clinton trait-out of touch

R1-R3 - OPINIONS AND COMPLEX DECISIONS

R1. How opinionated is R
R1a. Fewer or more opinions than avg
R1a1. How much more opinions than avg
R1a2. More much fewer opinions than avg
R1x. Summary degree R opinionated
R2. Does R like respnsbty for thinking
R2a. How much like respnbty for thinking
R2b. How much dislike rsbty for thinking
R2x. Summary like/dislike thinking
R3. Like simple or complex problems

S1-S5 - RELIGIOSITY

V000872  S1. Is religion important to R
V000873  S2. How much guidance from religion
V000874  S3/S3.T. How often does R pray
V000875  S4/S4.T. How often does R read the bible
V000876  S5/S5.T. Bible is word of God or men

X1-X9 - RELIGIOUS IDENTIFICATION

V000877  X1. Attend religious services
V000878  X1a. Part of a church or denomination
V000879  X2. Attend religious services how often
V000880  X2a. Attend relig serv > once/week
V000881  X3. Attend church checkpoint
V000882  X3a. Attend protestant/Cath/Jewish/other
V000883  X3b. Belong protestant/Cath/Jewish/other
V000884  X4. Denomination/other specify
V000885  X4(1). (blanked) denomination other
V000886  X4a. Baptist group
V000887  X4b. Independent Baptist group
V000888  X4c. Lutheran group
V000889  X4d. Methodist group
V000890  X4e. Presbyterian group
V000891  X4f. Reformed group
V000892  X4g. Brethren group
V000893  X4h. Christian group
V000894  X4i. Church of Christ group
V000895  X4j. Church of God group
V000896  X4k. (blanked) holiness/pentacostal
V000897  X4a-j. (blanked) other
V000898  X4m. (blanked) other group/denomination
V000899  X4m1. Is other group christian
V000900  X6a. Attend Jewish group
V000901  X6b. Jewish denomination
V000902  X7. Member place of worship
V000903  X8. Born-again christian
V000904  X9x. Religion summary

Y1-Y31A - DEMOGRAPHICS

V000905  Y1(1). Month of birth
V000906  Y1(2). Day of birth (blanked)
V000907  Y1(3). Year of birth
V000908  Y1x. Respondent age
V000909  Y2. Marital status
V000910  Y3. Highest grade completed
V000911  Y3a. Diploma/GED
V000912  Y3b. Highest degree earned
V000913  Y3x. R educ summary
V000914  Y4. Highest grade of partner
V000915  Y4a. Partner diploma/GED
V000916  Y4b. Partner highest degree
V000917  Y4x. Sp educ. Summary
Y6(1). Assigned employment status
Y6(2). 2 digit employment status
Y6(3). 1 digit employment status
Y9. R unemp: ever worked for pay
Y10a(1). 2-digit occup
Y10a(2). 3-digit occup (blanked)
Y10a(3). 1-digit occup summary
Y10a(4). Prestige code (blanked)
Y10b. R unemp: past industry code
Y10c. R unemp: past self employed
Y10d. R unemp: past employed by govt
Y10e. R unemp: work last 6 months
Y10f. R unemp: hrs/wk 6 months
Y10g. R unemp: looking for work now
Y10h. R unemp: worry about find job
Y11(1). Retired: month of retirement
Y11(2). Retired: year of retirement
Y12a(1). 2-digit occup retired
Y12a(2). 3-digit occup (blanked) retired
Y12a(3). 1-digit occup summary retired
Y12a(4). Prestige code (blanked) retired
Y12b. R ret: industry code
Y12c. R ret: self employed
Y12d. R ret: employed by govt
Y12e. R ret: work last 6 months
Y12f. R ret: hours/wk work 6 months
Y12g. R ret: working for pay
Y12h. R ret: looking for work now
Y12j. R ret: worry about finding job
Y13. R disabled: ever worked for pay
Y14a(1). 2-digit occup disabled
Y14a(2). 3-digit occup (blanked) disable
Y14a(3). 1-digit occup summary disabled
Y14a(4). Prestige code (blanked) disable
Y14b. R dis: industry code
Y14c. R dis: self employed
Y14d. R dis: work for govt
Y14e. R dis: work last 6 months
Y14f. R dis: hours/wk work 6 mnths
Y14g. R dis: working for pay now
Y14h. R dis: looking for work now
Y14j. R dis: worry about finding job
Y15. Homemaker/student: work for pay
Y15a. Hmk/stu: work last 6 mon
Y16a(1). 2-digit occup hmk/stu
Y16a(2). 3-digit occup (blanked) hmk/stu
Y16a(3). 1-digit occup summary hmk/stu
Y16a(4). Prestige code (blanked) hmk/stu
Y16b. Hmk/stu: industry code
Y16c. Hmk/stu: self employed
Y16d. Hmk/stu: worked for govt
Y16f. Hmk/stu: hrs/wk wrk last 6 months
Y16h. Hmk/stu: looking for work
Y16j. Hmk/stu: worry about finding job
Y17a(1). 2-digit occup R work now
Y17a(2). 3-digit occup (blanked) R wk now
Y17a(3). 1-digit occup summary R work now
Y17a(4). Prestige code (blanked) R wk now
Y17b. Work now/TLO: industry code
Y17c. Work now/TLO: self employed
V000973  Y7d. Work now/TLO: work for govt
V000974  Y7e. Work now/TLO: hours work
V000975  Y7f. Work now/TLO: work hours right
V000976  Y7g. Work now/TLO: worry lose job
V000977  Y7h. Work now: out work/layoff last 6mo
V000978  Y7j. Work now: reduction in hrs/pay
V000979  Y17(1). Stacked - 2 digit occup
V000979a Y17(1a). Stacked - 3 dig occup (blanked)
V000980  Y17(2). Stacked - 1 digit occup
V000981  Y17(3). Stacked - occ prestige (blanked)
V000982  Y17(4). Stacked - industry
V000983  Y17(5). Stacked - work for self
V000984  Y17(6). Stacked - employed by govt
V000985  Y17(7). Stacked - hours per week
V000986  Y17(8). Stacked - worr abt los/find job
V000987  Y17(9). Stacked - job in past 6 mos.
V000988  Y17(10). Stacked - looking for work
V000989  Y17(11). Stacked - ever work for pay
V000990  Y25. Anyone in HH belong to union
V000991a Y25a1. Who belongs to union #1
V000991b Y25a2. Who belongs to union #2
V000991c Y25a3. Who belongs to union #3
V000992  Y26. IWR chkpt: # of Persons age 14+
V000993  Y27/Y27.T. HH income - others in HH 14+
V000994  Y27x. HH income - all HHs
V000995  Y27a/Y27a.T. R income - others in HH 14+
V000996  Y28/Y28.T. R income - only HH member 14+
V000997  Y28x. R income - all HHs
V000998  Y29. Ever think of self as wrk/mid class
V000999  Y29a. Which one (workng or middle class)
V001000  Y29b. If had to choose class
V001001  Y29c. Middle class- avg or upper
V001002  Y29d. Middle class - feel close to class
V001003  Y29e. Working class - avg or upper
V001004  Y29f. Working class - feel close to class
V001005  Y29x. Soc.class summary
V001006a Y30(1). Racial group #1 self-description
V001006b Y30(2). Racial group #2 self-description
V001006c Y30(3). Racial group #3 self-description
V001007  Y30a. Both parents born in U.S.?
V001008  Y30b(1). Ethnic/nationality group #1
V001009  Y30b(2). Ethnic/nationality group #2
V001010  Y30bx. IWR cKpt: >2 ethnic mentions?
V001010a Y30bx2. Number of ethnic groups mentioned
V001011  Y30c. Choice of ethnic/nationality group
V001012  Y30x/Y31. Spanish or Hispanic descent
V001013  Y31a/Y31a.T. Category of Hispanic descnt

Z1-Z9 - ADDITIONAL DEMOGRAPHICS
----------------------------------------------------

V001014  Z1. Where R grew up-ICPSR st/cntry code
          V001015  F Z2. FTF- urbanicity where grew up
          V001016  TB Z2.T. Phone -urbanicity where grew up
          V001017  T Z2a. Phone -urbanicity where grew up
          V001018  T Z2b. Phone - urbanicity where grew up
          V001019  Z2x. Comb. Summary where R grew up
          V001020a Z3(1). Mos. -how long lived in community
          V001020b Z3(2). Yrs. -how long lived in community
          V001020c Z3x. Summ. - how long lived in community
Z4(1)/Z4(1). T. Mos.-length resid in home
Z4(2)/Z4(1). T. Yrs.-length resid in home
Z4x. Summ. - length residence in home
Z5. Does R family own/rent home
Z8. Does R have children
Z8a. How many children R has under 18
Z8b. R's children under 18 living w/R
Z8c(1). Mention 1 minor child age
Z8c(2). Mention 2 minor child age
Z8c(3). Mention 3 minor child age
Z8c(4). Mention 4 minor child age
Z8c(5). Mention 5 minor child age
Z8c(6). Mention 6 minor child age
Z8c(7). Mention 7 minor child age
Z8c(8). Mention 8 minor child age
Z9. How many miles R drives per day

ZZ1-ZZ11 - PRE INTERVIEWER OBSERVATION

ZZ0. Education estimate if missed in IW
ZZ1. IWR obs: R gender
ZZ2. FTF IWR obs: R race
ZZ3(1). FTF: #1 others present during IW
ZZ3(2). FTF: #2 others present during IW
ZZ3(3). FTF: #3 others present during IW
ZZ3(4). FTF: #4 others present during IW
ZZ3(5). FTF: #5 others present during IW
ZZ4. IWR obs: R cooperation
ZZ5. IWR obs: R informed about politics
ZZ6. IWR obs: R intelligence
ZZ7. IWR obs: R suspicious
ZZ8. IWR obs: R interest in IW
ZZ9. IWR obs: R sincerity
ZZ9a. IWR: obs: insincere in what part (blanked)
ZZ10. IWR obs: R report income correctly
ZZ10a. IWR obs: est income -surv inc off
ZZ11(1). Mention 1 - R reaction to IW
ZZ11(2). Mention 2 - R reaction to IW
ZZ11(3). Mention 3 - R reaction to IW
ZZ11(4). Mention 4 - R reaction to IW
ZZ11(5). Mention 5 - R reaction to IW
ZZ11(6). Mention 6 - R reaction to IW
ZZ11(7). Mention 7 - R reaction to IW
ZZ11(8). Mention 8 - R reaction to IW
ZZ11(9). Mention 9 - R reaction to IW

PRE RANDOMIZATION DESCRIPTIONS

Pre.Rand.Clb. Pos-Gore in therms
Pre.Rand.Cl. Pos-Buchanan in therms
Pre.Rand.Cle. Pos-Nader in therms
Pre.Rand.Clf/g. Pos-McCain, Bradley ther
Pre.Rand.Clh/k. Pos-Cheney, Lieberman ther
Pre.Rand.C2. Order-parties in therms
Pre.Rand.F1-F3. Order-Gore, GWB, Buchn
A1-A4 - CURRENT CAMPAIGN AND POLITICS

V001201  A1. R interest in campaigns
V001202  A2. R watched programs about campaign
V001203  A2a. How many programs R watched about campaign
V001204  A3. Does R ever discuss politics
V001205  A3a. How often does R discuss politics
V001206  A4. Does R recall names of House candidates
V001207  A4a1. Hse name recall 1 - cand code
V001208  A4b1. Hse party recall 1
V001209  A4(1)x1. Actual party of recall 1
V001210  A4(2)x2. Accuracy of recall 1
V001211  A4a2. Hse name recall 2 - cand code
V001212  A4b2. Hse party recall 2
V001213  A4(2)x1. Actual party of recall 2
V001214  A4(2)x2. Accuracy of recall 2
V001215  A4a3. Hse name recall 3 - cand code
V001216  A4b3. Hse party recall 3
V001217  A4(3)x1. Actual party of recall 3
V001218  A4(3)x2. Accuracy of recall 3

B1-B12 - PARTICIPATION, CONTRIBUTIONS

V001219  B1. Party talked to R about campaign
V001220  B1a. Party that spoke to R about campgn
V001221  B1b. Anyone else talk to R about cans
V001222  B1c. Party send R mail about campaign
V001223  B1c1. Party that sent mail about campaign
V001224  B1d. Anyone else send mail about campaign
V001225  B2. Did R try to influence vote of others
V001226  B3. Did R display button/sticker/sign
V001227  B4. Did R go to meetings/rallies etc.
V001228  B5. Did R do any other campaign work
V001229  B6. Did R contribute to candidate
V001230  B6a. Party of candidate - R contribution
V001231  B7. Did R give money to party
V001232  B7a. Party - R contribution
V001233  B8. Did R give to group for/against candidate
V001234  B9. Did anyone talk to R about registering or voting
V001235  B10. Did moral/relig groups discuss campaign w/R
V001236  B11. Clergy provide election information
V001237  B12. Did clergy encourage R to vote for cand or prty
V001238  B12a1. Clergy endorsement 1
V001239  B12a2. Clergy endorsement 2
V001240  B12a3. Clergy endorsement 3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Did R vote?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Was R registered?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Registered in county of IW?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3a1</td>
<td>State of registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3a2</td>
<td>County of registration (blank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Did R vote on election day or before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4a</td>
<td>How long before election did R vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4b</td>
<td>Did R vote in person or absentee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>Did R vote for President?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>R vote cast for President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6a</td>
<td>How strong R support Pres cand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>Timing of Pres vote decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8(1)</td>
<td>If R cld have cast more than one vote -1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8(2)</td>
<td>If R cld have cast more than one vote -2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8(3)</td>
<td>If R cld have cast more than one vote -3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9</td>
<td>Hse ckpt: vote in/out county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9a</td>
<td>In-county: vote for House?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9b</td>
<td>In-county House vote - party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9(1)</td>
<td>Hse ckpt: order of Dem/Rep names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9a</td>
<td>In-county: order of Dem/Rep names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9b</td>
<td>In-county House vote - cand code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9b(1)</td>
<td>In-county House vote - cand code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9b(2)</td>
<td>In-county House vote - party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10a</td>
<td>Out-county: vote for House?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10b1</td>
<td>Out-county - House vote - cand code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10b2</td>
<td>Out-county - House vote - party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10c</td>
<td>Out-party ment of Hse vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10x1</td>
<td>Summary- Hse vote cand code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10x2</td>
<td>Summary- Hse vote party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13</td>
<td>Sen ckpt: vote in/out county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13a</td>
<td>In-county: vote for Senate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13b1</td>
<td>In-county Senate vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13b2</td>
<td>In-county Senate vote - cand code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13b3</td>
<td>In-county Senate vote - party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13b4</td>
<td>In-county Senate vote - cand code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13b5</td>
<td>In-county Senate vote - party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14a</td>
<td>Out-county:vote for Senate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14b1</td>
<td>Out of county - Sen vote - cand code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14b2</td>
<td>Out of county - Senate vote party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14c</td>
<td>Out of county- party of Sen vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14x1</td>
<td>Summary- Sen vote - cand code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14x2</td>
<td>Summary- Sen vote - party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C17</td>
<td>Nonvoter - prefer any Pres cand?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

NONVOTER PREFERENCES FOR HOUSE, SENATE

V001276  C17. Nonvoter - prefer any Pres cand?
C20 - FAIRNESS OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

V001291
C20. How fair was November election

D1-D2 - THERMOMETERS

V001292
D1a/D1a.T. Thermometer Clinton
V001293
D1b/D1b.T. Thermometer Gore
V001294
D1c/D1c.T. Thermometer GW Bush
V001295
D1d/D1d.T. Thermometer Nader
V001296
D1e/D1e.T. Thermometer Jesse Jackson
V001297
D1f/D1f.T. Thermometer former Pres Bush
V001298
D1g/D1g.T. Thermometer Dem House cand
V001299
D1h/D1h.T. Thermometer Rep House cand
V001300
D1i/D1i.T. Thermometer retiring Hse rep
V001300a
D1j/D1j.x. Checkpoint: Hse retiree also Sen cand?
V001301
D1k/D1k.T. Thermometer Dem Senate cand
V001302
D1m/D1m.T. Thermometer Rep Senate cand
V001303
D1n/D1n.T. Thermometer Ind House cand
V001303a
D1nx. Checkpoint: VT01 or VA05
V001304
D2a. Thermometer supreme court
V001305
D2b. Thermometer Congress
V001306
D2c. Thermometer military
V001307
D2d. Thermometer federal govt in Wash DC
V001308
D2e. Thermometer blacks
V001309
D2f. Thermometer whites
V001310
D2g. Thermometer conservatives
V001311
D2h. Thermometer liberals
V001312
D2j. Thermometer labor unions
V001313
D2k. Thermometer big business
V001314
D2m. Thermometer poor people
V001315
D2n. Thermometer people on welfare
V001316
D2p. Thermometer Hispanics
V001317
D2q. Thermometer Chrstn Fundamentalists
V001318
D2r. Thermometer women's movement
V001319
D2s. Thermometer older people
V001320
D2t. Thermometer environmentalists
V001321
D2u. Thermometer homosexuals
V001322
D2v. Thermometer Christian Coalition
V001323
D2w. Thermometer Catholics
V001324
D2x. Thermometer Jews
V001325
D2xx. Thermometer Protestants
V001326
D2y. Thermometer feminists
E1-E4 - HOUSE CANDIDATE LIKES/DISLIKES

E1. Like anything- Dem House cand
   E1a(1). #1 like Dem House candidate
   E1a(2). #2 like Dem House candidate
   E1a(3). #3 like Dem House candidate
   E1a(4). #4 like Dem House candidate
   E1a(5). #5 like Dem House candidate

E2. Dislike anything- Dem House cand
   E2a(1). #1 dislike Dem House candidate
   E2a(2). #2 dislike Dem House candidate
   E2a(3). #3 dislike Dem House candidate
   E2a(4). #4 dislike Dem House candidate
   E2a(5). #5 dislike Dem House candidate

E3. Like anything- Repub House cand
   E3a(1). #1 like Repub House candidate
   E3a(2). #2 like Repub House candidate
   E3a(3). #3 like Repub House candidate
   E3a(4). #4 like Repub House candidate
   E3a(5). #5 like Repub House candidate

E4. Dislike anything- Repub House cand
   E4a(1). #1 dislike Repub House candidate
   E4a(2). #2 dislike Repub House candidate
   E4a(3). #3 dislike Repub House candidate
   E4a(4). #4 dislike Repub House candidate
   E4a(5). #5 dislike Repub House candidate

E5-E7 - POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE (HOUSE AND SENATE)

E5. Checkpt: number of Hse cands
   E5a(1). 2 cands- either cand incumbent
   E5a(2). Cand iden as incum- 2 cand race

E6. Party control House before election
E7. Party control Senate before election

F1-F4 - MEMBER OF CONGRESS

F1. Appr/dissapr House incumbent
   F1a. Strength approve House incumbent
   F1b. Strength disapprove House incumbent

F2. Special action by incumbent
F3. R know #yrs Hse incumbent has serv
F3a. #yrs House incumbent has been in of
F3b. Incumbent more/less 12 yrs in offic
F4. House incumb kept in touch w/distric

F5 - FOLLOW PUBLIC AFFAIRS

F5. R follows govt and public affairs

G1-G10 - LIBERAL-CONSERVATIVE PLACEMENT
### SELF, CLINTON, GORE, BUCHANAN AND PARTIES

| V001368 | G1a/G1a.T. R placement lib-con scale |
| V001369 | G1b. Had to choose lib-con self-placemt |
| V001370 | G1x. 3-category lib-con summary |
| V001371 | G2/G2.T. Clinton placement lib-con scale |
| V001372 | G3/G3.T. Gore placement lib-con scale |
| V001373 | G3a/G3a.T. Gore-certain lib-con placement |
| V001374 | G4/G4.T. Bush placement lib-con scale |
| V001375 | G4a/G4a.T. Bush-certain lib-con placement |
| V001376 | G5/G5.T. Buchanan placement lib-con scale |
| V001377 | G5a/G5a.T. Buchanan-certain lib-con |
| V001378 | G6. Ckpt: number of cands/VT01/VA05 |
| V001378a | G6.(1)/G6(1).T. Dem Hse cand placement-lib |
| V001378b | G6.(2)/G6(2).T. #1 incum Ind cand place |
| V001379a | G6a1/G6a1.T. Dem Hse cand-certain lib-con |
| V001379b | G6a2/G6a2.T. #1 incum Ind cand-certain lib |
| V001380a | G7.(1)/G7(1).T. Rep Hse cand placemnt-lib |
| V001380b | G7.(2)/G7(2).T. #2 incum Ind cand-lib |
| V001381a | G7a1/G7a1.T. Rep Hse cand-certain lib-con |
| V001381b | G7a2/G7a2.T. #2 incum Ind cand-lib |
| V001382 | G8/G8.T. Dem Party placement lib-con scale |
| V001383 | G9/G9.T. Repub Party placement lib-con |
| V001384 | G10/G10.T. Reform Party placement lib-con |

### G11 - SERVICES/SPENDING TRADEOFF

| V001385 | FR | G11a. R placement- services/spend scale |
| V001386 | TB | G11a.T. R placement-services/spend branch |
| V001387 | TB | G11a1.T. How much reduce services/spend |
| V001388 | TB | G11a2.T. How much increase services/spend |
| V001389 | B | G11ax1. Summary R serv/spend scale- branching |
| V001390 | BR | G11ax2. Summary R serv/spend scale- branch & scale |

| V001391 | B | G11b. Ckpt: number of cands/VT01/VA05 |
| V001391a | FR | G11b(1). Dem Hse candidate on services/spending |
| V001391b | FR | G11b(2). #1 Ind incumbent Hse cand on services/spend |
| V001392a | TB | G11b(1).T. Dem Hse cand on services/spending |
| V001392b | TB | G11b(2).T. #1 Ind incumbent Hse cand on serv/spend |
| V001393a | TB | G11b1(1).T. Dem cand- how much reduce services/spend |
| V001393b | TB | G11b1(2).T. #2 Ind incumbnt Hse cand- how much red |
| V001394a | TB | G11b2(1).T. Dem Hse cand-how much incresase serv/sp |
| V001394b | TB | G11b2(2).T. #1 Ind incumbnt Hse cand- how much incr |
| V001395a | TB | G11b3(1).T. Dem Hse cand- if serv/spend chnged, inc/dec |
| V001395b | TB | G11b3(2).T. #1 Ind inc Hse cand- if chnged, incr/decr |
| V001396 | B | G11bx1. Summary Dem cand serv/spend - branching |
| V001396a | BR | G11bx2. Summary Dem cand serv/spend -branch & scale |

| V001397a | FR | G11c(1). Repub House candidate on services/spend |
| V001397b | FR | G11c(2). #2 Ind inc Hse cand on services/spending |
| V001398a | TB | G11c(1).T. Rep Hse cand on services/spending |
| V001398b | TB | G11c(2).T. #2 Ind incumbent Hse cand on services/spnd |
| V001399a | TB | G11c1(1).T. Rep Hse cand- how much reduce services/sp |
| V001399b | TB | G11c1(2).T. #2 Ind incumbent Hse cand- how much reduc |
| V001400a | TB | G11c2(1).T. Rep Hse cand-how much incresase serv/spd |
| V001400b | TB | G11c2(2).T. #2 Ind incumbent Hse cand- how much incre |
G12 - ABORTION
----------------------------------------
V001403  G12/G12.T. R placement- abortion scale
V001404  G12a. How important is abortion issue to R
V001405  G12b. Checkpoint: number of cands/VT01/VA05
V001405a G12b(1)/G12b(1).T. Dem Hse cand plac on abortion
V001405b G12b(2)/G12b(2).T. #1 Ind inc cand plac on abort
V001406a G12b1(1)/G12b1(1).T. Dem Hse cand-certainty of plcmt
V001406b G12b1(2)/G12b1(2).T. #1 Ind inc cnd-certainty of plc
V001407a G12c(1)/G12c(1).T. Rep Hse cand plac on abortion
V001407b G12c(2)/G12c(2).T. #2 Ind inc cand placmt on abort
V001408a G12c1(1)/G12c1(1).T. Rep Hse cand-certainty of plct
V001408b G12c1(2)/G12c1(2).T. #2 Ind inc cnd-certainty of plct

G13 - PARTY ID WITHOUT INDEPENDENT MENTION
---------------------------------------------
V001409  G13. R thinks of themself as Republican or Democrat

H1-H3 - R'S FINANCIAL SITUATION
---------------------------------------------
V001410  H1. R better/worse off in last year financially
V001411a H1a. How much better off in last yer financially
V001411b H1b. How much worse off last year financially
V001412  H1x1. Summary of R's financial situation in last year
V001412a H1x2. Pre & Post Summary of R's financial situation
V001413  H2. Put off medical or dental treatmnt in last year
V001413a H2x. Pre & post- Put off medical or dental treatmnt
V001415  H3a. How much better off next year financially
V001415a H3a. How much better off next year financially
V001416  H3b. How much worse off next year financially
V001417  H3x. Summary: R financial expectations in next year
V001417a H3x. Summary: R financial expectations in next year

H4 - FEAR OF BEING ASSAULT VICTIM
---------------------------------------------
V001418  H4. How afraid is R of assault in next year

J1- JURY DUTY
---------------------------------------------
V001419  J1. R's attitude about serving on jury duty

J2 - GOVERNMENT ROLE AND SELF-RELIANCE
---------------------------------------------
V001420  J2a. Less govt, or more things government should do
V001421  J2b. Strong govt to handle cmlx prbls or free mrket
V001422  J2c. Reason govt is bigger- meddlersome or big prblms
V001423  J2d. Better cooperative or self-reliant

J3-J10 - MEDIA/INTERNET EXPOSURE AND INFORMATION
| V001424 | J3. # times R watched jeopardy |
| V001425 | J4. # times R watched wheel of fortune |
| V001426 | J5. # times R watched morning news |
| V001427 | J6. # times R watched daytime talk show |
| V001428 | J7. Network news program R watches most |
| V001429 | J8. How much can you trust the media |
| V001430 | J9. Does R listen to political talk radio |
| V001431 | J9a. How often does R listen to talk radio |
| V001432 | J9b. How closely does R listen to talk radio |
| V001433 | J10. Does R have Internet or WWW access |
| V001434 | J10a. Has R seen election info on Internet |

### J11- DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PARTIES

| J11. Important differences b/w Reps/Dems |
| J11a1(1). #1 difference b/w Reps/Dems |
| J11a1(2). #1 party refnce b/w Reps/Dems |
| J11a2(1). #2 difference b/w Reps/Dems |
| J11a2(2). #2 party refnce b/w Reps/Dems |
| J11a3(1). #3 difference b/w Reps/Dems |
| J11a3(2). #3 party refnce b/w Reps/Dems |
| J11a4(1). #4 difference b/w Reps/Dems |
| J11a4(2). #4 party refnce b/w Reps/Dems |
| J11a5(1). #5 difference b/w Reps/Dems |
| J11a5(2). #5 party refnce b/w Reps/Dems |
| J11a6(1). #6 difference b/w Reps/Dems |
| J11a6(2). #6 party refnce b/w Reps/Dems |

### K1- GROUP INFLUENCE: TOO MUCH, TOO LITTLE, RIGHT AMT

| K1a. Whites influence |
| K1b. Blacks influence |
| K1c. Hispanics influence |
| K1d. Asian-Americans influence |
| K1e. Jews influence |
| K1f. Protestants influence |
| K1g. Catholics influence |
| K1h. Men influence |
| K1j. Women influence |

### K2 - OFFICE RECOGNITION OF POLITICAL FIGURES

| V001446a S | K2a. Identify Trent Lott -standard |
| V001446b E | K2a.E. Identify Trent Lott -experimental |
| V001447 | K2ax. Summary identify Trent Lott |
| V001448 E | K2al.E. Identify Trent Lott- DK probe used |

| V001449a S | K2b. Identify William Rehnquist -standard |
| V001449b E | K2b.E. Identify William Rehnquist -experimental |
| V001450 | K2bx. Summary identify William Rehnquist |
| V001451 E | K2bl.E. Identify William Rehnquist - DK probe used |

| V001452a S | K2c. Identify Tony Blair -standard |
| V001452b E | K2c.E. Identify Tony Blair-experimental |
| V001453 | K2cx. Summary identify Tony Blair |
| V001454 E | K2cl.E. Identify Tony Blair - DK probe used |

---

[link to electionstudies.org page](http://www.electionstudies.org/studypages/2000prepost/anest2000prepost_int.txt)
K3-K4 - KNOWLEDGE ABOUT PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES

V001458  K3a. In what state does Bush live
V001459  K3a1. Respondent was probed for DK answer
V001460  K3b. What is Bush's religion
V001461  K3b1. Respondent was probed for DK answer
V001462  K4a. What state is Gore from
V001463  K4a1. Respondent was probed for DK answer
V001464  K4b. What is Gore's religion
V001465  K4b1. Respondent was probed for DK answer

K5-K6 - KNOWLEDGE ABOUT VICE-PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES

V001466  K5a. In what state does Cheney live
V001467  K5a1. Respondent was probed for DK answer
V001468  K5b. What is Cheney's religion
V001469  K5b1. Respondent was probed for DK answer
V001470  K6a. In what state does Lieberman live
V001471  K6a1. Respondent was probed for DK answer
V001472  K6b. What is Lieberman's religion
V001473  K6b1. Respondent was probed for DK answer

K7 - INVOLVEMENT IN VOLUNTEER WORK

V001474  K7. Volunteer work in last year

K8-K10 - TRUST IN PEOPLE

V001475  K8. Are people trustworthy
V001476  K9. People take advantage or act fairly
V001477  K10. People helpful or selfish

K11 - DISCRIMINATION AGAINST HOMOSEXUALS

V001478  K11. Fav/opp laws protect against job discrm homosexu
V001479  K11a. How much favor law protecting homosexuals
V001480  K11b. How much oppose law protecting homosexuals
V001481  K11x. Summary protctng homosxls against job discrim

K12 - WAYS TO REDUCE CRIME

V001482  FR  K12a. R plcmnt crime -address social prblms/punish
V001482a TB  K12a.T. R plcmnt crime -address social prbl/punish
V001483 TB  K12a1.T. How much btr is approach -adressing social
V001484 TB  K12a2.T. How much btr is approach -punishing crimls
V001485 TB  K12a3.T. If had to choose, which approach is better
V001486  B   K12ax. Summary branch- R plcmnt on approach
V001486a BR  K12ax. Summary brh & scale- R plcmnt on approach
K13-K14 - WORRY ABOUT WAR

V001487  
K13. How worried is R about nuclear war

V001488  
K14. How worried is R about conventional war

K15-K16 - CAMPAIGN FINANCE

V001489  
K15a. Campn fin- protect govt from infl or individ

V001490  
K16. How should the financing of campaigns change

(there are no items L1-L4)

L5-L7 - INVOLVEMENT WITH COMMUNITY OR ISSUE

V001491  
L5. Worked on community issue in last year

V001492  
L6. Contacted public official to express in last year

V001493  
L7. Attend commun meeting about issue in last year

L8 - ORGANIZATIONAL INVOLVEMENT AND INFLUENCE

V001494  
L8. Is R a member of any organizations

V001495  
L8a. How many organizations is R currently a member

V001496  
L8b. 1 org-how many hours per week spent for org

V001497  
L8c. 1 org-do orgs try to influence government

V001498  
L8d. 1 org-does org try to influence schools

V001499  
L8bb. 2+ org-how many hours per week spent for org

V001500  
L8cc. 2+ org-does org try to influence government

V001501  
L8dd. 2+ org-does org try to influence schools

V001502  
L8x1. Summary hours per week spent for org

V001503  
L8x2. Summary org influence schools

V001504  
L8x3. Summary org influence government

V001505  
L9. Contributed to church or charity in last year

L10 - PROTEST

V001506  
L10. Taken part in Protest or march in last year

V001507  
L10a. How many times protested/marched

M3 - POSITION OF BLACKS IN SOCIETY

(there are no items m1-m2)

V001508  
M3a/M3a.T. Blks should overcome prejudice w/o favors

V001509  
M3b/M3b.T. Blacks have gotten less than they deserve

V001510  
M3c/M3c.T. If blks wld try harder they cld be well off

V001511  
M3d/M3d.T. Past discrim impacts blks today

N1 - POWER OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

V001512  
N1. R have opinion on strength of federal govt

V001513  
N1a. Govt is getting too powerful or not too strong

V001514  
N1a1. Should govt become more powerful

V001515  
N1b. Which party favors a strong federal govt
## N2 - POLITICAL EFFICACY OF THE RESPONDENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V001516</td>
<td>N2a/N2a.T. Does R have good understanding of pol issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V001517</td>
<td>N2b/N2b.T. R well-qualified to participate in politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V001518</td>
<td>N2c/N2c.T. Could do good job in public office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V001519</td>
<td>N2d/N2d.T. Better informed about govt than most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V001520</td>
<td>N3. Does R believe their vote matters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## P1 - EGALITARIANISM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V001521</td>
<td>P1a/P1a.T. Society needs to give everyone equal oppr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V001522</td>
<td>P1b/P1b.T. We've pushed equal rights too far</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V001523</td>
<td>P1c/P1c.T. We don't give everyone equal chance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V001524</td>
<td>P1d/P1d.T. Better if we worried less about equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V001525</td>
<td>P1e/P1e.T. OK if some people have more chances than</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V001526</td>
<td>P1f/P1f.T. We'd have fewer probs if people treated eq</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Q1 - EXTERNAL POLITICAL EFFICACY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V001527</td>
<td>Q1a/Q1a.T. Public officials don't care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V001528</td>
<td>Q1b/Q1b.T. People don't have say in govt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V001529</td>
<td>Q1c/Q1c.T. Politics too complicated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Q2 - MORAL TRADITIONALISM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V001530</td>
<td>Q2a/Q2a.T. New morals are causing society breakdown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V001531</td>
<td>Q2b/Q2b.T. Should adjust views to chgd moral behav</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V001532</td>
<td>Q2c/Q2c.T. Less prblms if emphasize trad family ties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V001533</td>
<td>Q2d/Q2d.T. Should tolerate other's morality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Q3-Q6 - TRUST IN GOVERNMENT / MASS SUPPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V001534</td>
<td>Q3a. How much can govt be trusted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V001535</td>
<td>Q4. How much of taxes does govt waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V001536</td>
<td>Q5. Govt run by big interests or for benefit of all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V001537</td>
<td>Q6. How many in govt are crooked</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Q7-Q8 - GOVERNMENT RESPONSIVENESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V001538</td>
<td>Q7. Elections make govt pay attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V001539</td>
<td>Q8. Attn govt pays to people when making decisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## R1 - GROUPS R FEELS CLOSE TO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V001540</td>
<td>F. R1a. Close to whites FTF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V001540a</td>
<td>T. R1a.T. Close to whites phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V001541</td>
<td>R1a.x. Summary close to whites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V001542</td>
<td>F. R1b. Close to poor people FTF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V001542a</td>
<td>T. R1b.T. Close to poor people phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V001543</td>
<td>R1b.x. Summary close to poor people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V001544</td>
<td>F. R1c. Close to Asian Americans FTF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V001544a</td>
<td>T. R1c.T. Close to Asian americans phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V001545</td>
<td>R1c.x. Summary close to Asian Americans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V001546</td>
<td>F. R1d. Close to liberals FTF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
R2-R4 - CHARACTERISTICS OF RACIAL GROUPS

R2a/R2a.T. Hardworking- whites
R2b/R2b.T. Hardworking- blacks
R2c/R2c.T. Hardworking- Hispanic-America
R2d/R2d.T. Hardworking- Asian-American
R3a/R3a.T. Intelligence- whites
R3b/R3b.T. Intelligence- blacks
R3c/R3c.T. Intelligence- Hispanic-Americ
R3d/R3d.T. Intelligence- Asian-American
R4a/R4a.T. Trustworthy- whites
R4b/R4b.T. Trustworthy- blacks
R4c/R4c.T. Trustworthy- Hispanic-America
R4d/R4d.T. Trustworthy- Asian-American

R5- QUALITIES TO ENCOURAGE IN CHILDREN
R5a. Independence or respect for elders
R5b. Obedience or self-reliance
R5c. Curiosity or good manners
R5d. Considerate or well behaved

S1-S11 - CLINTON LEGACY
   (Rs were asked Clinton Legacy in either pre or post. See summary variables ".x1" for full sample)

S1. Budget deficit lar/smal since 1992
S1a. Deficit much/somewhat smaller
S1b. Deficit much/somewhat larger
S1x. Summary - budget deficit since 92
S1x1. Summary pre & post - budget deficit
S2. Spending on poor inc/dec since 92
S2a. Spend poor a lot/somwhat more/less
S2x. Summary - spending on poor since 92
S2x1. Summary pre & post - spending on poor
S3. Economy better/worse since 1992
S3a. Economy much/somewhat better
S3b. Economy much/somewhat worse
S3x. Summary - economy since 1992
S3x1. Summary pre & post - econ since 92
S3x1. Summary pre & post - econ since 92
S4. Clinton made economy better/worse since 92
S4a. Clinton made econ much/somewhat better
S4b. Clinton made econ much/somewhat worse
S4x. Summary - Clinton made econ better/worse
S4x1. Summary pre & post - Clinton made econ
S5. Clinton admin hurt/help R personally
S5. Summary pre & post Clinton admin hurt/help
S6. U.S. more/less secure since 1992
S6a. U.S. much/somewhat more secure
S6b. U.S. much/somewhat less secure
S6x. Summary - U.S. security
S6x1. Summary pre & post - U.S. security
S7. Clinton made U.S. more/less secure
S7a. Clinton made much/smwh more secure
S7b. Clinton made much/smwh less secur
S7x. Summ-Clinton impact on U.S. security
S7x1. Summ pre & post- Clinton impact on secur
S8. U.S. crime rate better/wors since 92
S8a. U.S. crime rate much/smwht better
S8b. U.S. crime rate much/smwht worse
S8x. Summary - U.S. crime rate
S8x1. Summary pre & post - U.S. crime rate
S9. Clinton made crime rate better/worse
S9a. Clinton made crime rate much/smwht bettr
S9b. Clinton made crime rate much/smwht worse
S9x. Summ-Clinton impact on crime rate
S9x1. Summ pre & post - Clinton impact on crime
S10. Moral climate better/worse since 92
S10a. Moral climate much/smwht better
S10b. Moral climate much/smwht worse
S10x. Summary - moral climate since 92
S10x1. Summ pre & post - moral climate since 92
S11. Clinton made moral climate better/worse
S11a. Clinton made moral clim mch/s better
V001627  S11b. Clinton made moral clim mch/s worse
V001628  S11x. Summ-Clinton impact on moral climate
V001628a S11x1. Summ pre & post- Clinton impact on moral climate

S14 - CLINTON AFFECTS
(Rs were asked Clinton Affects & traits in either pre or post. See summary variables for full sample)
----------------------------------------------------
V001629  S14a. Clinton makes R angry
V001629a S14ax. Summ pre & post Clinton - angry
V001630  S14al. How often Clinton makes R angry
V001630a S14alx. Summ pre & post - how often angry
V001631  S14b. Clinton makes R hopeful
V001631a S14bx. Summ pre & post Clinton - hopeful
V001632  S14bl. How often Clinton make R hopeful
V001632a S14blx. Summ pre & post - how often hopeful
V001633  S14c. Clinton makes R afraid
V001633a S14cx. Summ pre & post Clinton - afraid
V001634  S15cl. How often Clinton makes R afraid
V001634a S15clx. Summ pre & post - how often afraid
V001635  S14d. Clinton makes R proud
V001635a S14dx. Summ pre & post Clinton - proud
V001636  S14dl. How often Clinton makes R proud
V001636a S14dlx. Summ pre & post - how often proud

S15 - CLINTON TRAITS
----------------------------------------------------
V001637  S15a. Clinton trait - moral
V001637a S15ax. Summ pre & post-Clinton trait - moral
V001638  S15b. Clinton trait-cares about people
V001638a S15bx. Summ pre & post-Clinton trait-cares
V001639  S15c. Clinton trait - knowledgeable
V001639a S15cx. Summ pre & post-Clinton knowledgeable
V001640  S15d. Clinton trait-strong leadership
V001640a S15dx. Summ pre & post-Clinton leadership
V001641  S15e. Clinton trait - dishonest
V001641a S15ex. Summ pre & post-Clinton dishonest
V001642  S15f. Clinton trait - intelligent
V001642a S15fx. Summ pre & post-Clinton-intelligent
V001643  S15g. Clinton trait - out of touch
V001643a S15gx. Summ pre & post-Clinton out of touch

T1-T4 - CAMPAIGN MEDIA EXPOSURE
----------------------------------------------------
V001644  T1. Did R watch a Pres debate on tv
V001645  T1a. Did R watch an entire or just part of debate
V001646  T2. Did R listen to campaign speeches or diss on radio
V001647  T2a. How much did R listen to radio speeches & diss
V001648  T3/T3.T. How much attention to Pres campaign news
V001649  T4/T4.T. How much attention to Cong campaign news

T5 - OPINION ABOUT TWO PARTY SYSTEM
----------------------------------------------------
V001650  T5/T5.T. Two parties, no labels, or new party
T6 - DEMOCRACY IN THE UNITED STATES

V001651

T6. Is R satisfied with US Democracy

V1-V4 - BUSH LEGACY

V001652

V1. Bush effect on US economy

V001653

V1a. How much better Bush made economy

V001654

V1b. How much worse Bush made economy

V001655

V1x. Summary: Bush effect on economy

V001656

V2. Bush made US more secure

V001657

V2a. Bush made US how much more secure

V001658

V2b. Bush made US how much less secure

V001659

V2x. Summary: Bush effect on security

V001660

V3. Bush effect on US crime rate

V001661

V3a. Bush made crime rate how much better

V001662

V3b. Bush made crime rate how much worse

V001663

V3x. Summary: Bush effect on crime

V001664

V4. Bush effect on moral climate

V001665

V4a. Bush moral climate how much better

V001666

V4b. Bush moral climate how much worse

V001667

V4x. Summary: Bush effect on moral climate

V5 - TRAITS - FORMER PRESIDENT BUSH

V001668

V5a. Bush trait - moral

V001669

V5b. Bush trait - cares about people

V001670

V5c. Bush trait - knowledgeable

V001671

V5d. Bush trait - strong leadership

V001672

V5e. Bush trait - dishonest

V001673

V5f. Bush trait - intelligent

V001674

V5g. Bush trait - out of touch

V5-Y17 - CHARACTERISTICS OF WORK COLLEAGUES

(there are no items y1-y4)

V001675

Y5. Is R currently working

V001676a

Y6a. Why is R not working, reason 1

V001676b

Y6b. Why is R not working, reason 2

V001676c

Y6c. Why is R not working, reason 3

V001677

Y7. Workers: How satisfied is R with work

V001678

Y7a. WRKS: Does R spend work time with people

V001679

Y8. WRKS: Rs coworkers looking out for themselves

V001680

Y8a. WRKS: Do Rs coworkers try to take advantage

V001681

Y8b. WRKS: Do Rs coworkers treat others with respect

V001682

Y8c. WRKS: Does honest describe Rs coworkers

V001683

Y8d. WRKS: Racial diversity of Rs coworkers

V001684

Y10. Laid off:Does R spend days alone/with others

V001685

Y11. LOFF: Rs coworkers just looking out for selves

V001686

Y11a. LOFF: Do Rs coworkers try to take advantage

V001687

Y11b. LOFF: Do Rs coworkers treat others with respect

V001688

Y11c. LOFF: Does honest describe Rs coworkers

V001689

Y15. Retired:Does R spend days alone/with others

V001690

Y16. RET: Rs coworker look out for themselves

V001691

Y16a. RET: Did Rs coworkers try to take advantage
V001692  Y16b. RET: Were Rs coworkers respectful
V001693  Y16c. RET: Does honest describe Rs coworkers
V001694  Y17x. Summary: R work with others
V001695  Y18x. Summary: co-workers look out for selves
V001696  Y18ax. Summary: co-workers try to take advantage
V001697  Y18bx. Summary: co-workers treat others w/respect
V001698  Y18cx. Summary: co-workers honest

21-224 - POLITICAL DISCUSSION IN SOCIAL NETWORK
---------------------------------------------------------------------
V001699  21. Person R discusses politics with: name 1
V001700  23. Person R discusses politics with: name 2
V001701  25. Person R discusses politics with: name 3
V001702  27. Person R discusses politics with: name 4
V001703  29. Is name 1 relative
V001704  29a. Is name 1 male or female
V001705  29b. Is name 1 coworker
V001706  29c. Does name 1 go to church with R
V001707  29d. Is name 1 a neighbor
V001708  210. How often does R discuss politics w/name 1
V001709  211. How much does name 1 know about politics
V001710  212. How name 1 voted in election
---------------------------------------------------------------------
V001711  213. Is name 2 relative
V001712  213a. Is name 2 male or female
V001713  213b. Is name 2 coworker
V001714  213c. Does name 2 go to church with R
V001715  213d. Is name 2 a neighbor
V001716  214. How often does R discuss politics w/name 2
V001717  215. How much does name 2 know about politics
V001718  216. How name 2 voted in election
---------------------------------------------------------------------
V001719  217. Is name 3 relative
V001720  217a. Is name 3 male or female
V001721  217b. Is name 3 coworker
V001722  217c. Does name 3 go to church with R
V001723  217d. Is name 3 a neighbor
V001724  218. How often does R discuss politics w/name 3
V001725  219. How much does name 3 know about politics
V001726  220. How name 3 voted in election
---------------------------------------------------------------------
V001727  221. Is name 4 relative
V001728  221a. Is name 4 male or female
V001729  221b. Is name 4 coworker
V001730  221c. Does name 4 go to church with R
V001731  221d. Is name 4 a neighbor
V001732  222. How often does R discuss politics w/name 4
V001733  223. How much does name 4 know about politics
V001734  224. How name 4 voted in election
---------------------------------------------------------------------
V001735  225. Has R worked with neighbor on common issue/year
V001736  226. How satisfied is R with neighborhood
V001737  227. Are neighbors just looking out for themselves
V001738  227a. Do neighbors try to take advantage of others
V001739  227b. Do neighbors treat others w/respect
V001740  227c. Does honest describe neighbors

Z25-Z29 - R'S NEIGHBORHOOD
---------------------------------------------------------------------
V001735  225. Has R worked with neighbor on common issue/year
V001736  226. How satisfied is R with neighborhood
V001737  227. Are neighbors just looking out for themselves
V001738  227a. Do neighbors try to take advantage of others
V001739  227b. Do neighbors treat others w/respect
V001740  227c. Does honest describe neighbors

Z27d. What is the racial diversity of neighborhood

Z28. How satisfying is Rs life

Z21-Z28 - INTERVIEWER OBSERVATION

Z21(1). Others present for interview
Z21(2). Others present for interview
Z21(3). Others present for interview

Z22. Rs cooperation
Z23. Rs knowledge of politics
Z24. Rs apparent intelligence
Z25. How suspicious did R seem
Z26. How great Rs interest in IW
Z27. How sincere did R seem
Z27a. Areas IWR doubted sincerity

Z211(1). Rs reaction to IW
Z211(2). Rs reaction to IW
Z211(3). Rs reaction to IW
Z211(4). Rs reaction to IW
Z211(5). Rs reaction to IW
Z211(6). Rs reaction to IW
Z211(7). Rs reaction to IW

POST RANDOMIZATION DESCRIPTIONS

Post-Rand.C9(2).
Post-Rand.D2b-D2d.
Post-Rand.D2g.
Post-Rand.D2h.
Post-Rand.D2j.
Post-Rand.D2k.
Post-Rand.D2m.
Post-Rand.D2n.
Post-Rand.D3a.
Post-Rand.D3b.
Post-Rand.D3c.
Post-Rand.D3d.
Post-Rand.D3e.
Post-Rand.D3f.
Post-Rand.D3g.
Post-Rand.D3h.
Post-Rand.D3j.
Post-Rand.D3k.
Post-Rand.D3m.
Post-Rand.D3n.
Post-Rand.D3q.
Post-Rand.D3r.
Post-Rand.D3s.
Post-Rand.D3t.
Post-Rand.D3u.
Post-Rand.D3v.
Post-Rand.D3w.
Post-Rand.D3x.
| V001781 | Post-Rand.D3xx. |
| V001782 | Post-Rand.D3y. |
| V001783 | Post-Rand.D3z. |
| V001784 | Post-Rand.E1/E3. |
| V001785 | Post-Rand.G3-G5. |
| V001788 | Post-Rand.G11b/c. |
| V001789 | Post-Rand.G12b/c. |
| V001790 | Post-Rand.R2b-R2d. |
| V001791 | Post-Rand.R3b-R3d. |
| V001792 | Post-Rand.R4b-R4d. |
| V001793 | Post-Rand.S14a. |
| V001794 | Post-Rand.S14b. |
| V001795 | Post-Rand.S14c. |
| V001796 | Post-Rand.S14d. |
| V001798 | Post-Rand.S15b. |
| V001799 | Post-Rand.S15c. |
| V001800 | Post-Rand.S15d. |
| V001801 | Post-Rand.S15e. |
| V001802 | Post-Rand.S15f. |
| V001803 | Post-Rand.S15g. |
| V001805 | Post-Rand.V5b. |
| V001806 | Post-Rand.V5c. |
| V001807 | Post-Rand.V5d. |
| V001808 | Post-Rand.V5e. |
| V001809 | Post-Rand.V5f. |
| V001810 | Post-Rand.V5g. |