**Background Information on the ANES 2008 Time Series Questionnaires**
**(Advance Release Version)**

Jon A. Krosnick and Arthur Lupia, ANES Principal Investigators
Vincent L. Hutchings, ANES Associate Principal Investigator
Matthew DeBell, ANES Director of Stanford Operations
Darrell Donakowski, ANES Director of Studies

March 5, 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.  INTRODUCTION

The American National Election Studies (ANES) is dedicated to providing in-depth, high-quality surveys on the topic of federal elections in the United States. This document provides background information on the questionnaires used in the 2008 version of the ANES Time Series study. In particular, this document describes our rationales for a number of decisions pertinent to the questionnaire's design.

We provide this information so that users may better understand the questionnaire's content. Part of the questionnaire includes questions that have been asked in previous ANES surveys. But this questionnaire does not only look to the past. It was also designed with the special circumstances of the 2008 election and future scholarship in mind. Hence, this questionnaire is unique in a number of respects.

For example, because this election featured the first African-American nominee by a major party, we devoted interviewing time to making measurements that would allow scholars to explore the impact of race-related factors on voting behavior and other electorally-relevant phenomena.

Another new and exciting component of the study involves over-samples of African-American respondents and Latino respondents. These large oversamples will allow scholars to better characterize electorally-relevant characteristics of these groups by examining whether specific hypotheses are true of the group as a whole or only of important subsets.

The most striking forward-looking element of the questionnaire, however, is a large-scale split-ballot experiment that entails asking each respondent one of two versions of traditional ANES questions that have been asked in many past surveys.  This large-scale experiment was motivated by the following logic.

If the purpose of the ANES were only (or even primarily) to track trends in attitudes and behaviors over time, then we should continue to measure these constructs using the same questions asked in the same order that they have been asked in the past.  The reason for this is that question wording and order changes can alter results, so changing question wording or order from one year to the next can cause apparent changes in results that might be misdiagnosed as real trends in Americans' thinking or action over time but are in fact attributable to methodological shifts. This kind of outcome has occurred in the past (e.g., The Changing American Voter) and we would not want to contribute to a repeat of that experience.

However, tracking trends is not the only purpose of the ANES or even the main purpose, in our opinion. We believe that the main purpose of the ANES is to equip scholars to accurately understand the causes of turnout and vote choice decisions in American elections, especially presidential elections.  To do a survey that includes measures lacking in reliability or validity handicaps researchers' abilities to achieve this goal and can lead researchers to mistake illusory findings based on correctable measurement errors for substantively meaningful relationships.

For example, suppose that the ANES questionnaire measures party identification using state-of-the-art best measures that maximize reliability and validity. Suppose further that its measures of citizens' preferences on policy issues are less reliable and valid. Now imagine that a researcher conducts a regression that attempts to explain vote choice using the party identification and policy preference measures referenced above. Suppose further that she finds party identification to have a much larger effect than policy preferences. In this situation, her finding could have several causes. One possible cause of her finding is that party identification is genuinely a stronger determinant of vote choices. Another possible cause is the difference in quality of the respective measures. Hence, to minimize the likelihood that researchers will mistake artifactual relationships for substantively meaningful ones, our goal is to offer the best available measure of all of the constructs that ANES questionnaires include.

The accumulating literature on optimal questionnaire design suggests that a number of traditional ANES questions are designed in suboptimal ways that compromise measurement accuracy, unnecessarily add to respondents' cognitive burden, and/or unnecessarily waste precious interviewing time. Hence, to allow researchers to conduct more accurate and reliable analyses, we set out to administer improved measures in the ANES 2008 Time Series.

Note, however, that if we were simply to discard the old question wordings and formats and ask instead all new wordings and formats, we would cause a serious disruption in the time series. This disruption would prevent retrospective analysis of trends. So we implemented improvements in these questions in a way that would provide rich research opportunities for scholars who wish to understand the past while improving an improved foundation for future work.

Specifically, we implemented what we call a "splice", where half of the 2008 respondents were randomly assigned to be asked the old version of a question, and the other half were randomly assigned to be asked the new version of the question. This way, researchers interested in looking at trends retrospectively can compare prior years' data to the 2008 data from respondents who were asked the old version of the question. And researchers interested in tracking trends from 2008 into the future can focus on respondents who were asked the new version of the question, assuming that this new version is asked in future ANES survey.

Because researchers are interested not only in trends in distributions but also trends in relations between variables, we designed the splice in a way to allow scholars to do such analysis. Specifically, we randomly assigned each respondent either to be asked old versions of all questions involved in the splice experiment or to be asked new versions of all these questions. That way, a researcher can compute correlations between pairs of items asked in the old version (for use in retrospective trend analyses) or between pairs of items asked in the new version (for use in prospective trend analyses).

This design is possible because the ANES 2008 Time Series survey included an unusually large sample, more than 2,000 respondents. This amount is roughly double the number of respondents interviewed in 2004. As a result, a sufficiently large number of respondents were asked each version of a question to permit adequate statistical power in an analysis using only one version's data.

It may be possible for some items to develop a way to "bridge" the two versions of the question into a single variable that can be used for analysis with the full survey sample. For example, many policy preferences are measured on two different versions of 7-point rating scales. A researcher who wishes to use all respondents' answers in a single analysis can do so by making assumptions about which responses to one version of a question match which responses to the other version. This is especially easy with the 7-point scales and may be possible for other items as well. This would allow researchers to maximize an analysis's sample size, while making the assumption that the bridging does not distort the results (which is of course testable by conducting analyses separately in the two half-samples to see if the same results are obtained).

Lastly, the splice design allows researchers to test whether what the literature suggests are improved question formats to maximize reliability and validity do indeed succeed in achieving this goal. That is, researcher can use the ANES 2008 Time Series data to test whether the new question formats yield

higher reliability and validity than the old question formats do.  If so, this would be a justification for continuing to ask new versions of affected questions in future ANES Time Series, presumably in splices resembling the ANES 2008 Time Series until the scholarly community is prepared to discard the old versions entirely and track trends into the future using the new versions.

It is important to note that some of the splices involve more than simply optimizing question wordings or formats while keeping the basic purpose of each item the same.  In some cases, we made large-scale changes in the approach that an item or set of items takes to measuring its intended target construct(s). A good example of this is exposure to news media content.  The community of scholars interested in these measures has long complained that the relevant ANES questions seem to be seriously flawed and to do a poor job of construct assessment.  We therefore introduced (though the splice) a new set of items designed to improve such measures.

In instances like this, our decision to include new measures was heavily influenced by the ANES 2006 Pilot Study.  Through the ANES Online Commons (which is described more below), a broad community of scholars proposed many ways that existing ANES measures could be improved. Consequently, the Pilot Study followed up on a number of these proposals and included new wordings and/or wording experiments.  When the Pilot Study data suggested that a new measurement approach would be an improvement, we included that approach in the ANES 2008 Time Series questionnaire.

Another noteworthy attribute of this questionnaire is the set of people who were instrumental in developing it. This is the first ANES Time Series questionnaire to be developed as a result of the Online Commons. The ANES Online Commons is a set of utilities that allows scholars to propose new questions, provide comment on old questions, and otherwise contribute in the questionnaire development process. In the years leading up to the ANES 2008 Time Series surveys, over 700 people participated in the Online Commons. Participants came from all over the world and from a wide array of academic disciplines. A substantial number of the proposals we received led to new questions being included on our 2008 questionnaires and/or old ANES questions being improved. Everyone at ANES is extraordinarily grateful to the Online Commons participants for their contributions to this questionnaire.

After we received the proposals, they were rigorously reviewed by the ANES Board of Overseers, Principal Investigators, and staff. Table 1 offers the timeline that connects Online Commons activities to final decisions about the questionnaire.

Table 1. Questionnaire Design Timeline

| | |
|---|---|
| 9/14/2007 | Opened the part of the Online Commons dedicated to the Time Series |
| 1/29/2008 | Closed this part of the Online Commons |
| 2/1/2008 | Proposals sent to the ANES Board |
| 3/14-15/2008 | ANES Board Meeting |
| Apr-Aug 2008 | Subsequent evaluation of proposals, pilot study reports. Staff generated additional evaluations of pilot study data. |
| 5/8/2008 | Contractual deadline for submitting pre-election questionnaire to the survey firm |
| 7/5-22/2008 | Pre-tested Pre-election questionnaire |
| 7/15/2008 | Contractual deadline for submitting post-election questionnaire to the survey firm |
| 8/15/2008 | Deadline for final changes to pre-election questionnaire |
| 8/23/2008 | Personal letters sent to every OC proposer. The letters included a description of which of their questions would and would not be included on the questionnaire. Additional feedback from the review process also conveyed. |
| 8/30/2008 | Content of 2008 questionnaires revealed at APSA Annual Meeting |
| 9/2/2008 | Pre-election interviews began |
| 9/16/2008-9/30/2008 | Pre-tested post-election questionnaire |
| 10/6/2008 | Deadline for final changes to post-election questionnaire |
| 11/3/2008 | Pre-election interviews ended |
| 11/5/2008 | Post-election interviews began |

| 12/30/2008 | Post-election interviews ended |
|---|---|

Early in the review process, we were able to identify a few proposals that contained theory and evidence sufficient for us to make decisions about the value of including their questions into the questionnaires. In many other cases, additional work had to be done. This work included finding additional sources of evidence that could clarify measurement validity questions and conducting analyses to determine the extent to which new questions could provide analytic value to the broad ANES user community. At key moments, we also assembled interdisciplinary groups of experts to advise us on important procedural and substantive matters. These groups are listed at the end of this document. We are especially grateful to the Board of Overseers and the ANES staff for their many contributions to this endeavor.

To assemble the final version of the questionnaire, we integrated the information and advice received from the scholars described above with a thorough review of previous ANES Time Series questionnaires, all 2008 Online Commons Proposals, the content of the 2008-09 ANES Panel Study, all ANES 2006 Pilot Study proposals, and all of the questions that we prepared for our recent collaboration with the National Longitudinal Studies.

One last general note about the content of the Time Series questionnaire. Given the importance of terrorism in contemporary political discussions, we were pleased to be offered the opportunity by NSF to collaborate with scholars who are experts on public thinking about terrorism in designing new questions for the 2008 Time Series Study. Through the Online Commons, these experts proposed questions whose inclusion would be paid for by a supplementary grant from NSF. After receiving and reviewing the proposals in the manner described above, we worked with the experts to optimize the formats, wordings, and content of the items in ways that would most effectively serve the scholarly goals of the ANES community.

The remainder of this document explains our decision making in greater detail. In Section II, we reproduce our project's mission statement. This statement reveals the basic motivation for our 2008 design decisions. Section III provides an overview of the kinds of changes that we made to the questionnaire. Section IV provides an inventory of specific changes.

We hope that this information will clarify important properties of the 2008 Time Series data and provide a stronger foundation for future debate and scholarship on ANES and other election survey questionnaires. To limit the document to a reasonable length, not all aspects of our questionnaire-related decision making processes are described here. A more comprehensive version of this document will be available on the ANES web site no later than December 2009.

In the meantime, if you have additional questions, please send them to us at anes@electionstudies.org

## II. PROJECT MISSION STATEMENT

Why do Americans vote as they do on Election Day? Answering this question illuminates some of the most fundamental aspects of American politics in particular and of democracy more generally. To understand election outcomes is to understand the relationship between rulers and ruled, governors and governed, leaders and followers, representatives and constituents in democratic nations. The effects of election outcomes on power relationships, public policy, and citizens' quality of life are widely felt and long lasting.

A full account of why Americans vote as they do in any election requires an analysis done at many levels and with reference to many causal factors. The story must include references to historic events unfolding around the world, the activities of organizations such as political parties and labor unions, shifts in the U.S. economy, choices made by the mass media, allocations of advertising dollars by campaign strategists, and much more. And indeed, there is no shortage of such accounts. Media pundits begin to offer explanations on the airwaves and in print even before the polls close. The victorious and defeated candidates propose their own stories of the forces at work. Ordinary citizens in coffee shops and cafés

around the country make sense of these historic moments in more personal ways, while observers in other nations apply their own meanings to these events.

The mission of the American National Election Studies (ANES) is to inform explanations of election outcomes and to enrich and deepen the theoretical tools developed, refined, and tested by social scientists for the purpose of understanding collective decision-making and the nature of modern governance.  ANES serves this mission by providing researchers with a view of the political world through the eyes of ordinary citizens. Such data are critical, because, in the end, these people's actions determine electoral outcomes.  One candidate's victory and others' defeats are the cumulative results of people pulling levers, coloring in empty ovals, punching out chads, drawing connections between pairs of adjacent horizontal lines, or deciding to stay at home instead.  To understand election results, we must explain what happened in the minds of these actors, describing what propelled them down the behavioral paths they chose.  The impact of all forces at work, forces that range from images in advertisements to shifts in the unemployment rate and beyond, ultimately passed through the hands that pulled, colored, punched, drew, or abstained.

With the help of ANES, social scientists have been in this business for over 50 years.  And with each passing year of scholarship, the portraits and profiles they offer are richer, more detailed, and more accurate.  With new discoveries, however, come new questions about the causes and consequences of electoral behaviors. The 2008 version of the ANES is designed to help scholars make such advances. The ANES is built in a way that allows it to serve thousands of research agendas simultaneously.

In developing this study, we began with the premise that ANES's core mission is to promote cutting-edge and broadly collaborative research on American national elections. We believe that to honor and help to expand the existing literature on voting and elections, we must continue to pursue the traditions of excellence established by past studies and, at the same time, take ANES in new directions, so as to empower scholars around the world to enhance the depth and breadth of our collective understanding of electorates.  For us, what matters most is the credibility of the study design and its ability to provide data infrastructure for the many scholars who seek to evaluate an ever-expanding range of important hypotheses. Such hypotheses explore causes and consequences of individual decisions about whether to be interested in politics, whether to participate in civic life, whether to vote in elections, and how to act when engaging in such activities.

ANES's agenda distinguishes it sharply from those of other political surveys. Many such surveys are proprietary. Surveys sponsored by news media organizations, political campaigns, political parties, interest groups, and others are either released to researchers only after in-house staff have exclusive rights to analyze and publish results from them or are never released at all. Most media and campaign polls are conducted quickly (in just a few days) and involve low response rates and very short questionnaires (rarely more than ten minutes). Rarely do media and campaign polls ask the same questions consistently over time, instead shifting questionnaires from survey to survey to address the events of recent days.  And it is very rare indeed to see the same respondent interviewed extensively before an election and then again after the election to understand more deeply the two behaviors that are our focus: vote choice and turnout.  Most importantly, few if any political surveys of any variety solicit extensive feedback from broad arrays of social scientists about the most effective way to draw samples, conduct interviews, or ask questions.

ANES provides a different service. Our mission is not to invest in activities that others do just as well or better. There is no need, for example, for us to run polls that augment headlines in real-time. Instead, our mission is to provide data that support rich hypothesis testing, maximize methodological excellence, measure many variables, and promote comparisons across people, contexts, and time. Instead, we develop ANES surveys with an eye to the future, so that their value increases over time. This strategy has served the project well in the past.  Interest in ANES surveys, even the ones that are over 50 years old, is not fading.

More than anything else, however, what distinguishes ANES from all other political surveys is that it can and has been based on broad scholarly input. We believe the study is at its best when it is driven by the ideas of many scholars and when it provides mechanisms for converting these ideas into more precise and scientifically relevant instrumentation. This questionnaire is faithful to this principle. It is based on extensive consultation with hundreds of scholars over several years.

In sum, our approach is founded on a set of basic values and beliefs. We value improved measurement and analysis of election-related phenomena. We value questions whose conceptual and theoretical foundations can be stated clearly and explicitly. We value debate about the design and content of ANES. We value the time series surveys. We believe in innovation and continuity. We believe that ANES should invest its resources in unique activities with broad social and scientific utility. We value transparency and accountability in how ANES studies are designed and in how the project spends money. And we believe that no person or institution should have privileged access to any product of ANES.


## III. GENERAL CHANGES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE


The main goal of the ANES Time Series studies is to allow a broad cross-section of scholars and citizens analyze high quality survey data pertinent to important questions about vote choice, turnout, and related matters in the context of the 2008 federal election. Our goal is to increase the range of election and vote-related hypotheses that can be analyzed and to operate in a way that benefits the largest possible scholarly community. In developing questionnaires, we seek insights from a broad population of scholars and experts.

The basic emphases are on helping analysts explain vote choice and turnout. However, such an emphasis yields data that augment a much larger set of research agendas. Voting is a form of choosing, and human choice is a topic in which many people are interested.

QUESTION ORDER

In surveys, we know that presentation order matters. We know that questions asked early in a survey can influence responses given later in a survey. We would like to report that our questionnaire is free of question order effects. However, each of the Time Series questionnaires includes hundreds of questions. With so many questions, it is possible that questions asked early will cause some respondents to have thoughts that they would not otherwise have had. It is also inevitable that some of these thoughts will persist in later parts of the interview and may cause respondents to answer questions differently than if they had not had the earlier thoughts.  It is also possible that the early questions can cause people to interpret the meanings of later questions differently than they would have interpreted those later questions.  We know as well that as a general rule, respondent fatigue grows the longer an interview continues.  This, too, can alter answers to later questions by virtue of their location.

With these facts in mind, we have taken steps to minimize order effects. These steps can be placed into two categories.

1. To minimize disruption to ANES users who base their analysis on data from multiple elections, we have attempted to minimize the number of changes in question order from the 2004 Time Series surveys to the 2008 Time Series surveys. As a result, changes in question order between 2004 and 2008 are the result of either
   a. The addition of new questions.
   b. A measurement validity-related reason for moving questions from one place in the survey to another.
   As a result, among the questions that appear on an ANES Time Series questionnaires in both 2004 and 2008, almost all are preceded by the same question in 2008 as in 2004, and almost all are followed by the same question in 2008 as in 2004.
2. Some question sequences on a given topic include general questions in addition to more specific questions.  For example, we ask respondents to evaluate the incumbent President's overall performance as well as his performance in a variety of specific domains.  In situations like this, we have tried to ask the general question before the specific questions, because past research has shown that asking the specific questions first can cause respondents to focus their later, general judgments on only the considerations mentioned in the specific questions (which of course were chosen by the

researchers without necessarily meaning to limit the scope of the respondent's general judgments). By asking the general question first, we allow the respondent to choose which considerations to draw from, uninfluenced by researcher decisions.

QUESTION WORDING

We reviewed all potential questions for the extent to which their wording corresponded to best practices in optimal questionnaire design. In many cases, we had access to data that allowed us to compare reliability and/or validity of different wording of a particular question. The ANES 2006 Pilot Study was the most frequent source of such data. In some cases, these data allowed us to draw a strong conclusion about which wording would provide more valid measurement of a concept. In other cases, the data were less determinative. In those cases, we applied our understanding of current theories and studies of optimal questionnaire design to choose amongst potential question wordings.

In choosing amongst question wordings, we treated existing ANES questions differently than questions that would be new to the Time Series. For newly proposed questions, we proceeded as described above without constraint. For questions that had appeared on previous ANES studies, we attempted to balance a desire for continuity (keeping the same wording over a period of year) and a desire for increasing measurement validity. In cases where these desires conflicted (i.e., when existing questions had suboptimal wording), we required meeting a high standard of evidence and burden of proof before we were willing to change the wording.

THE ANES CORE

ANES Time Series surveys have included two types of questions: CORE and non-CORE. CORE questions are those that the ANES has carried in the past and is committed to carrying in the future. Non-Core questions do not have this status.

Many scholars count on the ANES CORE as a basis for longitudinal analyses of a range of hypotheses. As a result, many scholars have long assumed the existence of a well-defined set of CORE questions. However, until very recently, the exact definition of the CORE was not well known in the community of scholars. Our efforts to make public a definition had several important consequences for the 2008 version of the Time Series. These efforts were as follows.

The report of the Planning Committee for the 2004 version of the ANES Time Series included the first public attempt to offer an explicit definition of the ANES CORE's content <ftp://ftp.electionstudies.org/ftp/nes/studypages/2004prepost/nes2004pc_report.pdf>. Internal project records, however, were inconclusive about the status of a number of questions. Hence, the 2004 Planning Committee document referred to multiple categories of questions, producing uncertainty about the exact nature of ANES's future commitment to a substantial number of questions.

Early on in the development of the 2008 questionnaires, we knew that we had to deliver to the public a statement about CORE content that produced no such uncertainty and that we had to deliver it well in advance of the fielding of the survey. The reason for these decisions is that we had committed to using the Online Commons as the primary venue for soliciting new questions. When opening the Online Commons, we announced that we not only wanted proposals for new questions, but we also hoped that scholars would make arguments about the value of retaining old questions. To make those efforts efficient for the scholars involved, we wanted to send a clear signal about which of the previous ANES Time Series questions would, and would not, be considered CORE.

Hence, in 2006, we developed a simple and concrete designation for all questions (CORE/not CORE) and released the list of such questions well in advance of fielding the studies (in fact, the release of the list was simultaneous with the opening of the part of the Online Commons that was devoted to the 2008 Time Series). We publicly promised to include all questions designated as CORE on the 2008 questionnaire. By contrast, we announced that we would need to see additional argumentation and/or evidence in favor of non-CORE questions in order for them to be considered. These announcements

served to codify and publicize efforts to determine a CORE that had been evolving at ANES for at least a decade.

Our primary rule for designating a question as CORE was procedural. If a question had been asked on each of the last four surveys, it was CORE. Our secondary rule was that if a question was publicly designated as CORE in the 2004 report to the user community, it too was CORE. Beyond that, we made a small number of judgment calls on questions that were central to the mission of the ANES and usable for testing many hypotheses.

This procedure for defining the CORE affected our subsequent decision making for the 2008 questionnaire. Our estimate of the time required to run the now-well-defined CORE was 82 minutes. The total interview time (counting both the pre-election and post-election waves of the Time Series study) was just over 164 minutes. Hence, the CORE constituted about half of the interviewing time.

A continuing challenge in designing the ANES Time Series questionnaires is the struggle between questionnaire continuity and questionnaire innovation. Questionnaire continuity allows the kinds of longitudinal analyses that many ANES users want to run. But the cost of continuity can be that innovation is squelched. We attempted to manage this challenge in a number of ways.

One strategy was to increase the total length of the interviews. We pursued a number of ways to increase total interview time in the 2008 Time Series. The cumulative result of our efforts is that our 2008 questionnaires are 29 minutes longer than the 2004 questionnaires. This is a 21% increase in questionnaire length.

Another strategy was to look for ways to bring innovations to the CORE. One way to innovate the CORE is to improve the measurement qualities of the questions. In a number of cases, we introduced what we believe are improved versions of existing CORE questions. In most cases, by "improvements," we mean changes in question stems or response categories in ways that increase the likelihood of reliable measurement. In some cases, measurement error is produced by response categories that different respondents interpret in different ways. In other cases, questions are double barreled, suggest false tradeoffs, or are vaguely worded.

In all cases where CORE questions were changed, the change was implemented using the splicing strategy described above. Specifically, every respondent was randomly assigned to one of two groups. One group received the "old" version of all CORE questions. The other group received "improved" versions of all CORE questions where attempted improvements were made. An important consideration in our decision to implement improvements in this way is that the size of the 2008 sample (2323 completed pre-election interviews, 2102 completed post-election interviews) is roughly double the size of the 2004 ANES Time Series study (1212 pre-election completions, 1067 post-election completions). Hence, the number of respondents receiving the original versions of all ANES CORE questions in 2008 was roughly the same as it was in 2004.


IV. SPECIFIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

This section provides brief documentation of every question that appears on the ANES 2008 Time Series questionnaires and is meant as a supplement to the codebook. This section does not repeat information that is included in the codebook, so it cannot be used as a substitute. Hence, the way to use this section is as a reference that can answer queries about the justification for every item in the questionnaire. The question ID numbers used in this document correspond to those used in the variable labels.

Each brief history offered below is described with respect to the following criteria:

- A question is part of the ANES CORE or it is not.
- A question is the same as one that was asked in 2004 or it is not.

The reference point for claiming that a question "has changed" is the ANES 2004 Time Series questionnaire.

For every question that was neither new nor changed, our description is limited to the fact that it repeats a question that appeared in 2004.

For every "new" or "changed" question, we offer a brief history of its rationale. We hope that the ANES and other surveys will continue and expand upon this practice of documenting question rationales, since scholars may frequently find it useful to understand the intellectual and analytic origins of survey questions.  A table of split administration and response order for these "new" or "changed" questions is provided as an appendix to this document.

Since many new or changed questions area product of the ANES 2006 Pilot Study, scholars who want to see the original proposals for that study can view them here: http://ftp.nes.isr.umich.edu/phpBB2/viewforum.php?f=2. After these questions were included on the Pilot Study, the original authors of the proposals submitted reports about the performance of the questions they proposed. These reports can be found here: http://www.electionstudies.org/resources/papers/pilotrpt.htm. In a number of cases, pilot study reports were not submitted, or we determined that we needed to run additional analyses to determine the likely value of the new questions to the ANES user community. In those cases, we commissioned additional analyses. Those analyses are not yet on the ANES website, but they will appear there before the end of 2009. Many scholars wrote subsequent proposals for the ANES 2008 Time Series studies that incorporated additional evidence regarding new questions. Those proposals can be found here: http://ftp.nes.isr.umich.edu/phpBB2/index.php

Although we document every question that is new to the 2008 questionnaire (relative to 2004), we do not identify 2004 questions that were dropped in 2008 except to say, as above, that no CORE questions were dropped.  Hence, all dropped questions are those that were publicly labeled non-CORE when the Online Commons for the Time Series study was opened. In almost all of these cases, no scholar used the Online Commons to argue for retention of the affected items.

Also worth noting is one issue that the ANES 2008 Time Series questionnaire does not cover well. In the weeks leading up to the 2008 election, a set of rare and severe events relating to the economy occurred. It is hard to look at this election without suspecting that its outcome was hugely influenced by these events.

As the timeline presented earlier shows, the 2008 Time Series production schedule for a national face-to-face survey that seeks to using CAPI required that questionnaires be finalized months prior to the beginning of interviewing (to maximize data quality, the survey instrument may be professionally programmed and rigorously evaluated before the study is fielded). As our interviewing started during the first week of September, our pre-election questionnaires were designed long before the events of October and November 2008 unfolded. We did include one question on the post-election study that addressed the growing government intervention into the banking industry that took place during the summer of 2008. And many of our core questions do touch on the economy. But we did not include questions on the October and November events, because we (and just about everyone else in the country, we'd guess) did not see them coming long enough in advance to write appropriate questions to specifically address them.


**PRE-ELECTION QUESTIONNAIRE**

A1. Two versions of an ANES CORE question were asked.

The old version begins with a sentence about attention and then asks about interest. A new version was run on the ANES 2006 Pilot Study. It simply asks about interest. Interest and attention need not be perfectly correlated. We recommend that ANES users evaluate these two versions and consider which version of the question would be most useful to ask in the future.

A2-A6. These are new questions. They are based on "likely voter screeners" run by leading news media polling organizations. Many such polling organizations use "likely voter screeners" to identify respondents who are likely to vote. Scholars and pundits have sometimes raised questions about the validity of these screening questions. We included these questions to allow a broad scientific community to evaluate their validity in a way that no single-cross-sectional survey can, since we reinterviewed our respondents post-election to determine whether they voted. In addition, we plan to collect validated turnout information on our respondents during 2009 to allow us to determine whether ANES survey respondents actually voted. The combination of likely voter screening questions and turnout validation data will give scholars unique opportunities to conduct rigorous analyses of the screening questions' validity.

A7-A9. Repeats ANES CORE questions about the presidential candidates.

A10. These are new questions. They query respondents' prospective assessments of how they will feel if either presidential candidate wins. These questions build on a growing literature in psychology suggesting that people routinely guess how they will feel under various circumstances in the future and use those guesses to plan their actions.

A11-A12. This series contains old and new versions of ANES media exposure questions. The new questions are the result of broad calls by the ANES user community to improve media exposure measures.

Half of the sample were asked the old ANES media exposure questions. Half of the sample got a new set of questions developed by Althaus and Tewksbury and Dulio and Towner. An argument for the new questions can be found here <ftp://ftp.electionstudies.org/ftp/anes/OC/2008timeseries/salthaus01.pdf> The new questions differentiate by mode (television, radio, newspapers, internet) and were tested on the ANES 2006 Pilot Study.

When attempting to include these new questions in the 2008 questionnaire, we discovered inconsistencies in how some of the "old" media questions had been asked in previous ANES Time Series surveys. We determined that in order to do a clean splice between a new generation of questions and the old generation, we would have to build a more comprehensive splice than with other "improved" CORE questions. Hence, the media splice builds from the following principles:

- Allow a clean comparison between questions asked in existing ANES formats and questions asked in the new format that was successfully piloted in 2006.
- Prior surveys had been inconsistent by sometimes asking about frequency of and sometimes asking about attention to, particular media. We therefore asked "old question," about both frequency and attention for every medium mentioned in CORE.
- Prior surveys had been inconsistent in whether they asked about attention to "the campaign for President." We included that phrase in all "old" questions. In new questions, we focused on national politics, since the mandate of the ANES is to study national elections broadly, rather than just the presidency.

Hence, we made the old questions consistent in order to allow scholars to attempt something closer to an apples-to-apples comparison with the new questions.

A13. Repeats an ANES CORE question. Unlike in 2004, when a question order experiment was run, this general question about presidential approval appears only before questions about presidential approval in specific areas.

A14. Repeats ANES CORE questions about presidential approval. From year to year in past ANES studies, the specific topics have changed. In 2004, the issues covered were "the economy," "foreign relations," "the environment," "health care," and "the war in Iraq."

A15-A16. Repeats ANES CORE questions about congressional approval.

B1. Repeats ANES CORE Feeling Thermometer questions about the incumbent president, the major party nominees for president and vice president, Hillary Clinton, Bill Clinton, Condoleeza Rice, and the two major parties.

C1-3. Repeats ANES CORE questions about the major political parties and Congress.

C4. These are new questions. They query respondents' views of how similar members of each of the major parties are to one another in terms of what they want government to do. They are the result of a proposal made to the ANES Online Commons.

C5-C8. Repeats ANES CORE questions about the respondent's financial condition.

D1-D2. Repeats ANES CORE questions about the respondent's emotional response to the major party candidates for President. The order in which the candidates are presented was randomized, as was the order of the response options (very often, fairly often, occasionally, rarely).

E1-E6. Repeats ANES CORE questions about political ideology, the extent to which the respondent cares about the election outcome, and the respondent's perceptions of how close the presidential election will be.

E7. This is a new question. We ask whether the respondent voted in a presidential primary or caucus and for whom they voted if they did participate. These questions were added in response to the heightened scholarly and public interest in the 2008 presidential primaries.

E8. This is a new question. It asks whether the respondent feels that voting is a duty. This question was proposed on the Online Commons and has many potential uses, including comparisons to similar questions asked in other democratic countries.

E9-E10. Two versions of an ANES CORE question are asked. The old questions ask about the respondent's feelings of efficacy in the political domain. New versions of these questions were proposed for and run on the ANES 2006 Pilot Study. The new questions convert the agree/disagree format of the old question into versions that are not prone to acquiescence bias. Recognizing that many scholars use responses to these questions to explain turnout or vote choice, we have moved these questions to the pre-election wave to eliminate the impact of the election outcome on responses (i.e., the outcome can change feelings of efficacy among some voters).

E11-12. These are new questions. They bring to the ANES a measure of a personality trait called self-monitoring. These questions were proposed for, and run on, the ANES 2006 Pilot Study.

F1-F2. Two versions of an ANES CORE question are asked. The old questions solicit the respondents' current and prospective views about the national economy. The new versions measure respondents' prospective assessments separately for each possible electoral outcome. This new wording will allow scholars to assess the extent to which a respondent's views about the future depend on the election outcome.

F3-F6. Repeats previous ANES questions. These questions seek respondents' beliefs about current and prospective inflation and unemployment.

F7. These are new questions. They provide measures of a respondent's financial vulnerability. These questions were proposed for, and run on, the ANES 2006 Pilot Study.

F8. Two versions of an ANES CORE question are asked about trust. The new version employs improved wording that was proposed for, and included on, the ANES 2006 Pilot Study.

G1-G2. Repeats ANES CORE questions about political party performance.

H1-H2. Repeats ANES CORE questions about the US's position in the world.

J1. Repeats ANES CORE questions about party identification.

K1-K2. Repeats ANES CORE questions about presidential candidate traits.

M1-M2. Repeats questions from the 2004 ANES Time Series about the Iraq War.

N1-N4. Two versions of ANES CORE questions are asked. These questions ask respondents to state their views and their beliefs about the views of the presidential candidates, on a number of policy issues. The old versions of these questions ask respondents to describe their beliefs using seven point scales. In those questions, the values "1" and "7" were given verbal labels. The values "2" through "6" were not given verbal labels. The literature on questionnaire design indicates that such unlabelled response options reduce measurement reliability and validity. New versions of the questions use a "branching" method with fully verbally labeled response options.  The old questions often suggested that people held only one of two points of view on these issues and may implicitly communicate the notion that the groups of people holding these two viewpoints are of about equal sizes. This implicit suggestion may distort people's answers. The new questions make no such suggestion.

N5. Repeats ANES CORE questions on government aid to blacks. These questions are of the same format as N1-N4 and have all of the same problems listed above. All respondents who received "old" versions of N1-N4 also received these questions. All other respondents did not receive these questions. Later in this pre-election interview and in the post-election interview, respondents received many new questions about race and politics.

P1. Repeats ANES CORE questions about federal spending priorities. In addition to CORE items, we repeat previous questions on highways, science, aid to the poor, and the war on terrorism and add a question on the environment.

P2-P3. These are new questions. They provide measures of respondents' views about progressive taxation for individuals and businesses. These questions were proposed for and run on the ANES 2006 Pilot Study.

P4. Two versions of ANES CORE questions are asked. The questions ask respondents to evaluate a tradeoff between protecting the environment and assuring employment for Americans. It is worded in the same manner as N1-N4 and has the same problems. In addition, the question assumes that there is a tradeoff between environmental protection and promoting employment, which contradicts the current notion of "green jobs." Hence a new set of questions is introduced to measure environmental attitudes without making such assumptions. The questions ask about specific environmental policies and have improved question wording and response options.

P5-P6. Repeats questions from 2000 and 2004 about gun ownership.

P7. Repeats ANES CORE questions on women's role. These questions are of the same format as N1-N4 and have all of the same problems listed above. All respondents who received "old" versions of N1-N4 also received these questions. All other respondents did not receive these questions. These questions were asked of a half sample due to lack of variance in response distributions in recent years. Almost no respondents have been willing to agree with the premise that "a woman's place is in the home." The lack of variance has diminished the question's analytic value.

Q1. Repeats ANES CORE questions about the respondent's vote intention.

Q2. These are new questions. They ask respondents to describe their views about a Black president. The question has an experimental component. Half of the respondents are asked about "all black people," and half are asked about all blacks other than Barack Obama. Scholars can use this question to clarify the extent to which respondents view Obama differently than other blacks who could be President. These

questions were inspired by questions designed for an ABC News/Washington Post Poll conducted in July, 2007.

Q3-Q4. These are new questions. They ask respondents to describe their views of a Black president. Questions of this kind were proposed for and run on the ANES 2006 Pilot Study.

R1-R3. Repeats previous ANES questions about the outgoing president.

W1-X6. Repeats ANES CORE questions about religion.

X7. Asks respondents if they are born-again Christians.

X8-X9. These are new questions. They ask Christians questions about the bases of their religious beliefs. These questions are self-administered, meaning that the interviewer gave the respondent their laptop so the respondent could read and/or hear (on headphones) the questions and answer choices. The respondent then typed a response into the laptop without communicating that response to the interviewer. This was done to reduce social desirability pressures.

X10-X11. Repeats previous ANES CORE questions about stereotypes. We were concerned that answers to these questions are affected by social desirability concerns. Hence, in 2008 we asked these questions in two ways. On the pre-election study, the questions were self-administered by the entire sample. On the post election study, where these questions have previously appeared, they are asked of the entire sample in the traditional manner (by an interviewer). Given the potential role of stereotypical beliefs in the 2008 election, and after extensive consultation with the Board of Overseers and a range of other experts, we decided to ask every respondent both versions of the question rather than half-sampling each version.

X12. This is a new question. It asks for the respondent's sexual orientation. Background on this question is provided in the ANES 2006 Pilot Study portion of the Online Commons. This question was self-administered to reduce social desirability pressures.

X13-X16. Repeats previous ANES CORE questions about policies relating to sexual orientation. We moved these questions from the post-election wave to the pre-election wave to allow them to be self-administered with the sexual orientation question.

Y1-Y35. Repeats ANES CORE demographic questions.

Y36. These are new questions. They ask about the number and types of telephones to which respondents have access. The purpose of these questions is to help scholars determine the effect of telephone ownership on survey sample properties. In particular, many telephone surveys have chosen not to seek to interview households without land line phones and with only cell phones. Because phone ownership did not affect inclusion in our sample, scholars can use these data to assess whether inability to reach certain types of phone owners affects survey results.

**POST-ELECTION QUESTIONNAIRE**

A1. Two versions of an ANES CORE question are asked.

The old version begins with a sentence about attention and then asks a question about interest. A new version was proposed for, and run on, the ANES 2006 Pilot Study. It simply asks about interest to avoid being double-barreled.

A2-A4. This series of questions includes old and new versions of ANES media exposure questions. The rationale for the new versions follows changes to the media exposure questions in the pre-election wave. In short, half of the sample again received the old ANES media exposure questions. The other half of the sample again got a new set of questions. The "new" questions were proposed for and run on the ANES 2006 Pilot Study.

B1-B10. Repeats ANES CORE questions about political mobilization. In addition, self-identified Hispanic respondents are asked about the ethnicity of, and language used by, the people who contacted them. These questions are part of a Bonus Minutes module designed by Gary Segura and Matt Barretto.

C1. Two versions of an ANES CORE question are asked.

The topic of these questions is voter turnout. The "old" version uses the recent version of the ANES turnout question. As has been well documented, this version of the question yields significant over-reporting of turnout in the aggregate. A new version of the question is designed to mitigate such over-reporting. It also queries whether respondents' memories of having voted pertain specifically to the 2008 general election or are a reflection of other past elections. The new version of the question was proposed for and run on the ANES 2006 Pilot Study.

C2-C4. Repeats ANES CORE questions about voter registration.

C5. Repeats ANES CORE questions about when and how a person voted.

C6-C8. Repeats ANES CORE questions soliciting whether, and for whom, respondents voted in election for President and the U.S. Congress.

C9-C10. These are new questions. They solicit the extent to which the respondent is optimistic or pessimistic about his/her own future and that of the nation. This question was proposed for and run on the ANES 2006 Pilot Study.

D1-D2. Repeats ANES CORE Feeling Thermometer questions about the incumbent president, the major party nominees for President, Vice President, and the U.S. Congress, the presidential candidates' wives, Hillary Clinton and a number of politically-relevant groups. Hindus and atheists are added to the list of groups as part of the module of questions about terrorism.

E1-E2. Repeats ANES CORE questions assessing respondents' knowledge and opinions of the U.S. Congress.

E3-E4. These are new questions. They solicit respondent beliefs about unemployment rates and gas prices. This question was proposed for and run on the 2006 ANES Pilot Study.

E5. Two versions of an ANES CORE question are asked.

The old version queries the frequency with which people "follow what's going on in government and public affairs." The new version distinguishes how closely a person pays attention to such matters from the frequency with which they do so. This new version of the question was proposed for and run on the ANES 2006 Pilot Study.

E6. These questions are new to the ANES. They solicit respondent views about the federal budget deficit and possible actions that can be taken with regard to it. Earlier versions of the ANES Time Series contained (non-core) questions on the same topic. These questions were worded in ways that made acquiescence bias likely and forced respondents to make false choices. New versions of the question are designed to eliminate these problems. They were originally developed for, and are imported from, the 2008-2009 ANES Panel Study.

F1. Repeats previous ANES questions about the goals of U.S. foreign policy.

F2. Repeats ANES CORE questions about fair employment for Blacks.

F3. Repeats a previous ANES question about the extent to which income inequality has changed over the past 20 years.

F4. Repeats an ANES CORE question about import limitations.

F5-F6. Repeats previous ANES questions about immigration policy.

G1-G2. Repeats ANES CORE questions asking the respondent to describe their own political ideology and that of the major party candidates for the U.S. House of Representatives in their congressional district.

G3-G6. Two versions of an ANES CORE question are asked.

The topic of these questions is abortion. The old version asks respondents to choose one of four general phrases that best describes their view on abortion as well as those of the major party presidential candidates. The new version describes specific circumstances and allows the respondent to describe his or her and the presidential candidates' views on in each case. These questions were proposed for and run on the ANES 2006 Pilot Study.

H1-H2. Repeats previous ANES questions about outsourcing and Social Security.

H3. Repeats ANES CORE questions about the desired size of government.

H4. Two versions of an ANES CORE question are asked.

The topic of these questions is political discussion. The old version asks whether the respondent ever performed each activity. The new version adopts parallel phrasing to the new media questions. This wording was proposed for the ANES 2006 Pilot Study and was run there as well.

H5-H7. These are new questions. They are designed to give scholars new opportunities to gauge the effect of race and gender in the electoral context. These questions were proposed for the ANES 2006 Pilot Study and were run there are well.

H8-H11. These questions are new to the ANES. They solicit respondent feelings about Blacks in general. They were drawn from other surveys and proposed to us by an interdisciplinary "race and gender committee" convened for the purpose of offering opinions about our coverage of matters pertinent to the nomination of Barack Obama for president. The members of this committee are acknowledged at the end of this document.

J1-J2. Repeats ANES CORE questions about differences between the major parties.

J3. Repeats ANES CORE questions that ask respondents to identify the political office held by several individuals.

J4-J9. Repeats previous ANES questions about kinds of organizations to which respondents belong.

K1. Repeats previous ANES questions about the extent to which black and/or Hispanic respondents feel that their fate is linked to that of their respective groups. A special rationale for including these questions in 2008 is the Black and Latino oversamples.

K2. Repeats previous ANES questions about sexual discrimination.

L1. Repeats ANES CORE questions about moral views.

L2. Repeats ANES CORE questions about the position of Blacks in society.

M1a. Two versions of an ANES CORE question are asked.

The question is about trust in the government in Washington. The old version offers four response options. The new version offers five response options, each of which is as specific as or more specific than the old version.

M1b-M1d. Repeats ANES CORE questions about trust in government.

M2-M3. Two versions of ANES CORE questions are asked.

These questions query the extent to which respondents believe that they can affect government action. The old versions ask respondents to agree or disagree with a number of statements about this topic. The agree/disagree format can lead to acquiescence bias. The new versions contain the same content but are asked in a ways that eliminate such bias.

M4. Repeats previous ANES questions about women's abilities.

M5. Repeats ANES CORE questions about affirmative action.

N1. Repeats previous ANES questions about desired traits in children and are often used to measure authoritarianism

N2. Repeats ANES CORE questions about social equality.

P1-P3. Repeats previous ANES questions that measure respondents' "need for cognition."

P4. This is a new question. It asks about the extent to which respondents believe that other people can change. These questions were proposed for and run on the 2006 ANES Pilot Study.

P5. This is a new question. It solicits respondent views on the likelihood a massive human tragedy in the next century.  This question was proposed for and run on the 2006 ANES Pilot Study.

Q1-Q2. Repeats ANES CORE questions about racial and ethnic stereotypes.  As previously stated, all respondents received these questions through self-administration in the Pre-election survey and by the interviewer (the traditional way) in the Post-election survey (its traditional placement).

Q3-Q15. These questions were supplied to the ANES by the CSES (Comparative Study of Electoral Systems) project. The CSES is a collaborative endeavor with over 50 participating nations. The participating nations agree to run a common set of questions on their questionnaires so that international comparisons can be made. Inclusion of these questions was a requirement of the current grant. 2008 is the third Time Series study on which CSES questions have been included.  This module contains a mix of previous ANES questions and new questions that are of particular interest to scholars interested in cross-national comparisons.

R1-S6. These questions are the product of a special competition. In 2005, the ANES was approached by NSF and the Department of Homeland Security about an opportunity to collect additional data. A cooperative venture of the two agencies allowed us to solicit from scholars questions that would be of value to the ANES user community and to scholars examining questions of interest to DHS. A special competition was held, and the ANES Board of Overseers reviewed all submitted proposals. The ANES PIs and staff then worked with the designate of DHS, Clark McCauley of Bryn Mawr College, to convert the proposals into this set of questions. Content in this section focuses on respondents' political activities, feelings about the federal government, and causes and consequences of terrorism. This set of questions has also been included on the 2008-09 ANES Panel Study.

T1-T6. These questions are the product of a Bonus Minutes module that was purchased by Donald R. Kinder and Nancy E. Burns of the University of Michigan. The module measures emotional responses to the outcome of the presidential election.

V1-V7. These questions are the product of a Bonus Minutes module that was purchased by Benjamin Phillips and Leonard Saxe of Brandeis University. Their module measures religiosity of the respondent and the respondent's spouse.

W1-W16. These questions are the product of a Bonus Minutes module that was purchased by Gary Segura and Matt Barretto of the University of Washington. The module is asked of self-identified Hispanics only. Its content addresses comfort with the English language, sources of political information, and a range of political topics.

Y1. This is a new question. It queries respondent views about the federal government's intervention into the banking industry. This question was drawn from a survey done by the Pew Center for the People and the Press.

Y2-Y4. These questions are new to the ANES. They solicit respondent opinions about the Iraq War. They were originally developed for the 2008-2009 ANES Panel Study.

Y5-Y7. These questions are new to the ANES. They offer measures of a concept called self-monitoring. The questions were proposed for, and run on, the ANES 2006 Pilot Study.

These questions are followed by an implementation of the Affect Misattribution Procedure (AMP). The AMP is a means for measuring implicit attitudes. Here, we used the method to measure implicit attitudes toward Blacks. The AMP was proposed to the ANES by Keith Payne of the University of North Carolina. A presentation and audio file offering more information about the AMP at its potential relevance to ANES users can be found here: http://www.electionstudies.org/conferences/duke/abstracts.html.

Y8. This question measures life satisfaction question and has been asked on many surveys. It is included in the survey to give respondents a question that is easy to answer in hopes of leaving them with a more positive view of the interview experience.


ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF INTERDISCIPLINARY COMMITTEES

In our efforts to improve the ANES, we worked with a substantial number of talented people. In addition to the ANES staff and Board of Overseers, we commissioned several groups to work with us on specific problems pertinent to the Time Series. These groups were as follows.

Race and gender committee
We thank Vince Hutchings of the University of Michigan for chairing the committee. We also thank all of the people who served on the committee: Nancy Burns of the University of Michigan, Kathleen Dolan of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Jack Dovidio of Yale University, Paula McClain of Duke University, Tom Pettigrew of UC Santa Cruz, Jim Sidanius of Harvard University, Kira Sabonmatsu of the Ohio State University, Virginia Sapiro of the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and David Wilson of the University of Delaware.

Weighting committee
We thank Douglas Rivers of Stanford University for chairing the committee. We also thank all of the people who agreed to serve on the committee, Martin Frankel of Baruch College, Charles Franklin of the University of Wisconsin-Madison, Andrew Gelman of Columbia University, and Colm O'Muircheartaigh of the University of Chicago.

Political Knowledge committee
We thank Larry Bartels and Markus Prior of Princeton University, Vincent Hutchings of the University of Michigan, Shanto Iyengar of Stanford University, and Scott Keeter of the Pew Research Center.

| | 2008 Pre-election: split administration and response order | | | RESP ORDER | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TAG | Description | SPLIT SAMP | SPLITTYPE | FWD | REV |
| A1a | Interested in following campaigns - VERSION A | √ | A OF A/B | x | x |
| A1b | Interested in following campaigns - VERSION B | √ | B OF A/B | x | x |
| A5 | How often does R vote | | | x | x |
| A10a1 | How happy or sad will R be if Dem Pres cand wins | | | x | x |
| A10b1 | How happy or sad will R be if Rep Pres cand wins | | | x | x |
| A11b | Days past week watch natl news on TV - OLD | √ | "OLD" | x | |
| A11b1 | Attention to national (network) news - OLD | √ | "OLD" | x | x |
| A11c1a | Days past wk watch local TV news in late aft/early eve - OLD | √ | "OLD" | x | |
| A11c1b | Days past week watch local news on TV in late evening - OLD | √ | "OLD" | x | |
| A11c2 | Attention to local news - OLD | √ | "OLD" | x | x |
| A11d1a | Days in past week read a daily newspaper? - OLD | √ | "OLD" | x | |
| A11d1b | Days in past week read a daily online newspaper? - OLD | √ | "OLD" | x | |
| A11d2 | Did R read about campaign in newspaper? - OLD | √ | "OLD" | x | |
| A11d2a | Attention to newspaper articles - OLD | √ | "OLD" | x | x |
| A11e | Days in past week listen to radio news? - OLD | √ | "OLD" | x | |
| A11e1 | Attention to radio news - OLD | √ | "OLD" | x | x |
| A12a1 | Days in typical week review news on internet? - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | |
| A12a1a | Time in typical day review news on internet (hrs)? - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | |
| A12a1a | Time in typical day review news on internet (min)? - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | |
| A12a1a1 | Attention to internet news - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | x |
| A12b | Days in typical week watch news on TV? - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | |
| A12b1 | Time in typical day watch news on TV (hours)? - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | |
| A12b1 | Time in typical day watch news on TV (minutes)? - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | |
| A12b1a | Attention to TV news - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | x |
| A12c | Days in typical wk read news in print newspaper? - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A12c1 | Time in typical day read news in print newpaper (hrs)? - NEW | √ | "NEW" | X | |
| A12c1 | Time in typical day read news in print newpaper (min)? - NEW | √ | "NEW" | X | |
| A12c1a | Attention to printed newspaper news - NEW | √ | "NEW" | X | X |
| A12d | Days in typical week listen news on radio? - NEW | √ | "NEW" | X | |
| A12d1 | Time in typical day listen news on radio (hrs)? - NEW | √ | "NEW" | X | |
| A12d1 | Time in typical day listen news on radio (min)? - NEW | √ | "NEW" | X | |
| A12d1a | Attention to radio news - NEW | √ | "NEW" | X | X |
| A15 | Care who wins House election | | | X | X |
| C4a | How similar are Republicans to one another | | | X | X |
| C4b | How similar are Democrats to one another | | | X | X |
| D1a-D1d1 | 4 affects - Dem Pres cand | | | X | X |
| D2a-D2d1 | 4 affects - Rep Pres cand | | | X | X |
| E9a | Politics/govt too complicated to understand - VERSION C | √ | C OF C/D | X | |
| E9b | Good understanding of political issues - VERSION C | √ | C OF C/D | X | |
| E9c | Public officials don't care what people think - VERSION C | √ | C OF C/D | X | |
| E9d | Have no say about what govt does - VERSION C | √ | C OF C/D | X | |
| E10a | Politics/govt too complicated to understand - VERSION D | √ | D OF C/D | X | X |
| E10b | Understanding of political issues - VERSION D | √ | D OF C/D | X | X |
| E10c | Public officials care what people think - VERSION D | √ | D OF C/D | X | X |
| E10d | People affect what govt does - VERSION D | √ | D OF C/D | X | X |
| E11 | Extent successfully defend opinion | | | X | X |
| E12 | How often see both disagreeing parties as right | | | X | X |
| F2a | Economy better or worse in next 12 months - VERSION E | √ | E OF E/F | X | |
| F2a1 | How much economy better or worse next 12 months - VERSION E | √ | E OF E/F | X | |
| F2b1 | Economy better or worse if Dem Pres cand wins - VERSION F | √ | F OF E/F | X | |
| F2b1a | How much econ better/worse if Dem Pres cand wins - VERSION F | √ | F OF E/F | X | |
| F2b2 | Economy better or worse if Rep Pres cand wins - VERSION F | √ | F OF E/F | X | |
| F2b2a | How much econ better/worse if Rep Pres cand wins - VERSION F | √ | F OF E/F | X | |
| F8a | Can people be trusted - - VERSION G | √ | G OF G/H | X | |
| F8b | Can people be trusted - - VERSION H | √ | H OF G/H | X | X |

| Code | Description | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| G1 | Which party better: handle economy  - Dem/Rep or Rep,Dem (wording) | | word order | x | x |
| G2a | Which party better: keep out of war  - Dem/Rep or Rep,Dem (wording) | | word order; P OF P/Q | x | x |
| G2b | Which party better: get into war  - Dem/Rep or Rep,Dem (wording) | | word order; Q OF P/Q | x | x |
| J1 | Party ID: think of self as Dem, Rep / think of self as Rep,Dem (wording) | | word order | x | |
| K1a1–K1a7 | Pres cand 1 - 7 traits - standard - VERSION J | √ | J OF J/K | x | x |
| K1b1–K1b7 | Pres cand 1 - 7 traits - revised - VERSION K | √ | K OF J/K | x | x |
| K2a1–K2a7 | Pres cand 2 - 7 traits - standard - VERSION J | √ | J OF J/K | x | x |
| K2b1–K2b7 | Pres cand 2 - 7 traits - revised - NEW | √ | K OF J/K | x | x |
| N1a | INTRO SPENDING SERVICES SCALE - OLD | √ | "OLD" | | |
| N1a1 | Spending and Services - 7-point scale self - OLD | √ | "OLD" | x | |
| N1b | Importance of spend-services issue to R - OLD  (reverse only) | √ | "OLD" | | x |
| N1c1 | Spending and Services: 1st Pres cand - OLD | √ | "OLD" | x | |
| N1c2 | Spending and Services: 2nd Pres cand - OLD | √ | "OLD" | x | |
| N1d | Spending and Services self - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | |
| N1d1 | Amount more/less spending and Services self - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | x |
| N1e | Importance of spend-services issue to R - NEW (reverse only) | √ | "NEW" | | x |
| N1f1 | Spending and Services: DemPres cand - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | |
| N1f1a | Amt more/less spending and Services: Dem Pres cand - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | x |
| N1f2 | Spending and Services: Rep Pres cand - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | |
| N1f2a | Amt more/less spending and Services: Rep Pres cand - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | x |
| N2a | INTRO DEFENSE SPENDING SCALE - OLD | √ | "OLD" | | |
| N2a1 | Defense spending - 7-point scale self - OLD | √ | "OLD" | x | |
| N2b | Importance of defense spending issue to R - OLD (reverse only) | √ | "OLD" | | x |
| N2c1 | Defense spending scale: Dem Pres cand OLD | √ | "OLD" | x | |
| N2c2 | Defense spending scale: Rep Pres cand OLD | √ | "OLD" | x | |
| N2d | Defense spending self - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | |
| N2d1 | Amount more/less defense spending self - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | x |
| N2e | Importance of defense spend issue to R - NEW (reverse only) | √ | "NEW" | | x |
| N2f1 | Defense spending: Dem Pres cand - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | |
| N2f1a | Amt more/less defense spend: Dem Pres cand - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | x |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| N2f2 | Defense spending: Rep Pres cand - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | |
| N2f2a | Amt more/less defense spend: Rep Pres cand - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | x |
| N3a | INTRO GOVT HEALTH INSURANCE SCALE - OLD | √ | "OLD" | | |
| N3a1 | Govt/private medical insurance scale: self-placement - OLD | √ | "OLD" | x | |
| N3b | Importance of govt insurance issue to R - OLD (reverse only) | √ | "OLD" | | x |
| N3c1 | Insurance scale: Dem Pres cand - OLD | √ | "OLD" | x | |
| N3c2 | Insurance scale: Rep Pres cand - OLD | √ | "OLD" | x | |
| N3d | Favor/oppose prescription drug coverage for seniors - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | |
| N3d1 | How much favor/oppose prescr drug coverage for seniors - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | x |
| N3e | Importance of presc drug coverage for seniors - NEW (reverse only) | √ | "NEW" | | x |
| N3f | Favor/oppose universal health coverage - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | |
| N3f1 | How much favor/oppose universal health coverage  - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | x |
| N3g | Importance of universal health coverage - NEW (reverse only) | √ | "NEW" | | x |
| N3h1 | Dem Pres cand favor/oppose universal health coverage - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | |
| N3h1a | How much Dem Pres cand favor/oppose univ health coverage - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | x |
| N3h2 | Rep Pres cand favor/oppose universal health coverage - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | |
| N3h2a | How much Rep Pres cand favor/oppose univ health coverage - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | x |
| N4a | INTRO GUARANTEED JOB-INCOME SCALE -OLD | √ | "OLD" | | |
| N4a1 | Guaranteed job-income scale: self-placement - OLD | √ | "OLD" | x | |
| N4b | Importance of guaranteed job-income issue to R - OLD (reverse only) | √ | "OLD" | | x |
| N4c1 | Guar job scale: Dem Pres cand - OLD | √ | "OLD" | x | |
| N4c2 | Guar job scale: Rep Pres cand - OLD | √ | "OLD" | x | |
| N4d | Favor/oppose illegal immigrant work period - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | |
| N4d1 | How much favor/oppose illegal immigrant work period  - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | x |
| N4e | Importance of illegal immigrant work period (reverse only) | √ | "NEW" | | x |
| N4f | Favor/oppose citizenship process for illegal immigrants - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | |
| N4f1 | How much favor/oppose citizenship process - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | x |
| N4g | Importance of citizenship process issue - NEW (reverse only) | √ | "NEW" | | x |
| N4h1 | 1st pres cand favor/oppose citizenship process - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | |
| N4h1a | How much Dem Pres cand favor/oppose citizenship process - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | x |

| Var | Description | √ | Type | Col1 | Col2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| N4h2 | 2nd pres cand favor/oppose citizenship process - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | |
| N4h2a | How much Rep Pres cand favor/oppose citizenship process - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | x |
| N5a | Aid to blacks scale: self-placement - OLD (2 sample only) | √ | "OLD" | x | |
| N5b1 | Importance of aid to blacks issue to R - OLD (reverse only; 3 sample) | √ | "OLD" | | x |
| N5b2 | Importance of aid to blacks issue to R - OLD (reverse only; 3 sample) | √ | "NEW" | | x |
| N5a | Aid to blacks scale: Dem Pres cand - OLD (2 sample only) | √ | "OLD" | x | |
| N5c1 | Importance of aid to blacks issue to Dem Pres cand - OLD (reverse only) | √ | "OLD" | | x |
| N5a | Aid to blacks scale: Rep Pres cand - OLD (2 sample only) | √ | "OLD" | x | |
| N5c1 | Importance of aid to blacks issue to Rep Pres cand - OLD (reverse only) | √ | "OLD" | | x |
| P1a1- P1n1 | Federal Budget Spending items: how much increase or decrease | | | x | x |
| P4a | INTRO ENVIRONMENT/JOBS TRADEOFF OLD | √ | "OLD" | | |
| P4a1 | Environment vs. jobs tradeoff scale self-placement - OLD | √ | "OLD" | x | |
| P4b | Importance of environment/jobs issue to R - OLD (reverse only) | √ | "OLD" | | x |
| P4c1 | Protect Environment-Protect Jobs scale DemPres cand - OLD | √ | "OLD" | x | |
| P4c2 | Protect Environment-Protect Jobs scale Rep Pres cand - OLD | √ | "OLD" | x | |
| P4d | Favor/oppose lower emission stds - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | |
| P4d1 | How much favor/oppose lower emission stds - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | x |
| P4e | Importance of emission std issue - NEW (reverse only) | √ | "NEW" | | x |
| P4f1 | Lower emission stds Dem Pres candidate - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | |
| P4f1a | How much lower emission stds Dem Pres candidate - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | x |
| P4f2 | Lower emission stds Dem Pres candidate - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | |
| P4f2a | How much lower emission stds Rep Pres candidate - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | x |
| P4g | Favor/oppose higher fuel standards - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | |
| P4g1 | How much favor/oppose higher fuel std  - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | x |
| P4h | Favor/oppose higher gas taxes - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | |
| P4h1 | How much favor/oppose higher fuel tax  - NEW | √ | "NEW" | x | x |
| P6a | Should it be harder or easier to acquire guns | √ | | x | |
| P6a1 | Importance of gun access issue to R - OLD (reverse only; 2 sample) | √ | "OLD" | | x |
| P6a2 | Importance of gun access issue to R - NEW (reverse only; 2 sample) | √ | "NEW" | | x |
| P7a | INTRO WOMEN'S ROLE - OLD (2 sample only) | √ | "OLD" | | |

| Tag | Description | √ | VERSION | FWD | REV |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| P7a1 | Womens role - 7-point scale self-placement - OLD (2 sample only) | √ | "OLD" | x | |
| P7b | Importance of women's role to R - OLD (reverse only; 2 sample) | √ | "OLD" | | x |
| P7c1 | Women's role scale Dem Pres cand - OLD (2 sample only) | √ | "OLD" | x | |
| P7c2 | Women's role scale Rep Pres cand - OLD (2 sample only) | √ | "OLD" | x | |
| Q2a1a | Black President make R uncomfortable - VERSION R | √ | | x | |
| Q2a1b | Black President make R uncomfortable - VERSION S | √ | | x | |
| Q2a2a | Black President make R pleased - VERSION R | √ | | x | |
| Q2a2b | Black President make R pleased - VERSION S | √ | | x | |
| R1a1-d1 | How often feel 4 affects about George W. Bush | | | x | x |
| R2a1-g1 | President - 7 traits - VERSION J | √ | J OF J/K | x | x |
| R2a2-g2 | President - 7 traits - VERSION K | √ | K OF J/K | x | x |
| X8a | Importance of belief in transsubstantiation - NEW (reverse only) | | | | x |
| Y2a | Marital status - VERSION M | √ | M OF M/N | x | |
| Y2b | Marital status - VERSION N | √ | N OF M/N | x | |

| 2008 Post-election: split administration and response order | | VERSION | RESP ORDER | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Tag | Description | VERSION | FWD | REV |
| A1a | A1a. Interested in following campaigns [VERSION OLD] | OLD | X | X |
| A1b | A1b. Interested in following campaigns [VERSION NEW] | NEW | X | X |
| A2a1 | A2a1. Watch campaign programs on TV [OLD] | OLD | | |
| A2a2 | A2a2. How many campaign programs on TV [OLD] | OLD | | |
| A2a3 | A2a3. Attention to TV news about Presidential campaign [OLD] | OLD | X | X |
| A2b1 | A2b1. Read about Presidential campaign in magazines [OLD] | OLD | | |
| A2b2 | A2b2. How many Pres campaign articles in magazines [OLD] | OLD | | |
| A2b3 | A2b3. Attention to magazine about Pres campaign [OLD] | OLD | X | X |
| A2c1 | A2c1. Hear radio speeches/discussn about Pres campaign [OLD] | OLD | | |
| A2c2 | A2c2. How many radio speech/discussn abt Pres campaign [OLD] | OLD | | |
| A2c3 | A2c3. Attention to radio about Presidential campaign [OLD] | OLD | X | X |
| A2d1 | A2d1. Read about campaign in newspaper [OLD] | OLD | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **A2d2** | A2d2. How many stories about campaign in newspaper [OLD] | **OLD** | | |
| **A2d3** | A2d3. Attention to newspaper about Pres campaign [OLD] | **OLD** | X | X |
| **A2e1** | A2e1. View/hear internet information abt Pres campaign [OLD] | **OLD** | | |
| **A2e2** | A2e2. How often internet info about Pres campaign [OLD] | **OLD** | | |
| **A2e3** | A2e3. Attention to internet info about Pres campaign [OLD] | **OLD** | X | X |
| **A2f** | A2f. General attention to Presidential campaign news [OLD] | **OLD** | X | X |
| **A3a1** | A3a1. Watch campaign programs on TV [NEW] | **NEW** | | |
| **A3a2** | A3a2. How many campaign programs on TV [NEW] | **NEW** | | |
| **A3a3** | A3a3. Attention to TV news about Presidential campaign [NEW] | **NEW** | X | X |
| **A3b1** | A3b1. Read about Presidential campaign in magazines [NEW] | **NEW** | | |
| **A3b2** | A3b2. How many Pres campaign articles in magazines [NEW] | **NEW** | | |
| **A3b3** | A3b3. Attention to magazine about Pres campaign [NEW] | **NEW** | X | X |
| **A3c1** | A3c1. Hear radio speeches/discussn about Pres campaign [NEW] | **NEW** | | |
| **A3c2** | A3c2. How many radio speech/discussn abt Pres campaign [NEW] | **NEW** | | |
| **A3c3** | A3c3. Attention to radio about Presidential campaign [NEW] | **NEW** | X | X |
| **A3d1** | A3d1. Read about Presidential campaign in newspaper [NEW] | **NEW** | | |
| **A3d2** | A3d2. How many stories abt Presc ampaign in newspaper [NEW] | **NEW** | | |
| **A3d3** | A3d3. Attention to newspaper about Pres campaign [NEW] | **NEW** | X | X |
| **A3e1** | A3e1. View/hear internet information abt Pres campaign [NEW] | **NEW** | | |
| **A3e2** | A3e2. How often internet info about Pres campaign [NEW] | **NEW** | | |
| **A3e3** | A3e3. Attention to internet info about Pres campaign [NEW] | **NEW** | X | X |
| **A3f** | A3f. General attention to Presidential campaign news [NEW] | **NEW** | X | X |
| **A4** | A4. How often trust the media to report news fairly | | X | X |
| **C1a** | C1a. R vote turnout [OLD] | **OLD** | | |
| **C1b1** | C1b1. R usually vote during the past 6 years [NEW] | **NEW** | | |
| **C1b2** | C1b2. R plan to vote during 6 months before election [NEW] | **NEW** | | |
| **C1b3** | C1b3. R vote turnout [NEW] | **NEW** | | |
| **C1b3a** | C1b3a. If not sure whether voted, did R probably vote [NEW] | **NEW** | | |
| **E5a** | E5a. Interest in politics and elections [VERSION OLD] | **OLD** | X | X |
| **E5b1** | E5b1. How close attn to politics and elections [VERSION NEW] | **NEW** | X | X |
| **E5b2** | E5b2. How often attn to politics and elections [VERSION NEW] | **NEW** | X | X |
| **F1a** | F1a. U.S. policy goal: preventing nuclea weapons | | X | X |
| **F1b** | F1b. U.S. policy goal: defending human rights | | X | X |
| **F1c** | F1c. U.S. policy goal: strengthen United Nations | | X | X |
| **F1d** | F1d. U.S. policy goal: combat world hunger | | X | X |
| **F1e** | F1e. U.S. policy goal: protect American jobs | | X | X |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **F1f** | F1f. U.S. policy goal: bring democracy to world | | **X** | **X** |
| **F1g** | F1g. U.S. policy goal: control illegal immigration | | **X** | **X** |
| **F1h** | F1h. U.S. policy goal: promote market economies abroad | | **X** | **X** |
| **F1j** | F1j. U.S. policy goal: combat intl terrorism | | **X** | **X** |
| **F6** | F6. How likely immigration take away jobs | | **X** | **X** |
| **G3a** | G3a. Abortion: self-placement [OLD] | **OLD** | | |
| **G3b** | G3b. How important is abortion issue [OLD] | **OLD** | | **X** |
| **G3c** | G3c. Abortion: President placement [OLD] | **OLD** | | |
| **G3d1** | G3d1. Abortion: Democratic Pres cand placement [OLD] | **OLD** | | |
| **G3d2** | G3d2. Abortion: Republican Pres cand placement [OLD] | **OLD** | | |
| **G3e1** | G3e1. Abortion: Democratic House cand placement [OLD] | **OLD** | | |
| **G3e2** | G3e2. Abortion: Republican House cand placement [OLD] | **OLD** | | |
| **G3f1** | G3f1. Abortion: Democratic party placement [OLD] | **OLD** | | |
| **G3f2** | G3f2. Abortion: Republican party placement [OLD] | **OLD** | | |
| **G4a** | G4a. Abortion: favor/oppose when nonfatal health risk [NEW] | **NEW** | | |
| **G4a1** | G4a1. How much favor abortion for nonfatal health risk [NEW] | **NEW** | | |
| **G4a2** | G4a2. How much oppose abortn for nonfatal health risk [NEW] | **NEW** | **X** | **X** |
| **G4a3** | G4a3. Lean favor/opp abortion for nonfatal health risk [NEW] | **NEW** | **X** | **X** |
| **G4b** | G4b. Abortion: favor/oppose when fatal health risk [NEW] | **NEW** | | |
| **G4b1** | G4b1. How much favor abortion for fatal health risk [NEW] | **NEW** | **X** | **X** |
| **G4b2** | G4b2. How much oppose abortion for fatal health risk [NEW] | **NEW** | **X** | **X** |
| **G4b3** | G4b3. Lean favor/oppose abortion for fatal health risk [NEW] | **NEW** | **X** | **X** |
| **G4c** | G4c. Abortion: favor/oppose in incest cases [NEW] | **NEW** | | |
| **G4c1** | G4c1. How much favor abortion in incest cases [NEW] | **NEW** | **X** | **X** |
| **G4c2** | G4c2. How much oppose abortion in incest cases [NEW] | **NEW** | **X** | **X** |
| **G4c3** | G4c3. Lean favor/oppose abortion in incest cases [NEW] | **NEW** | **X** | **X** |
| **G4d** | G4d. Abortion: favor/oppose in rape cases [NEW] | **NEW** | | |
| **G4d1** | G4d1. How much favor abortion in rape cases [NEW] | **NEW** | **X** | **X** |
| **G4d2** | G4d2. How much oppose abortion in rape cases [NEW] | **NEW** | **X** | **X** |
| **G4d3** | G4d3. Lean favor/oppose abortion in rape cases [NEW] | **NEW** | **X** | **X** |
| **G4e** | G4e. Abortion: favor/oppose in birth defect cases [NEW] | **NEW** | | |
| **G4e1** | G4e1. How much favor abortion in birth defect cases [NEW] | **NEW** | **X** | **X** |
| **G4e2** | G4e2. How much oppose abortion in birth defect cases [NEW] | **NEW** | **X** | **X** |
| **G4e3** | G4e3. Lean favor/oppose abortion in birth defect cases [NEW] | **NEW** | **X** | **X** |
| **G4f** | G4f. Abortion: favor/oppose in financial hardshp cases [NEW] | **NEW** | | |
| **G4f1** | G4f1. How much favor abortion in finan hardship cases [NEW] | **NEW** | **X** | **X** |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **G4f2** | G4f2. How much oppose abortion in finan hardship cases [NEW] | **NEW** | **X** | **X** |
| **G4f3** | G4f3. Lean fav/oppose abortion in finan hardship cases [NEW] | **NEW** | **X** | **X** |
| **G4g** | G4g. Abortion: favor/oppose when child gender 'wrong' [NEW] | **NEW** | | |
| **G4g1** | G4g1. How much favor abortn when child gender 'wrong' [NEW] | **NEW** | **X** | **X** |
| **G4g2** | G4g2. How much oppose abortn when child gender 'wrong' [NEW] | **NEW** | **X** | **X** |
| **G4g3** | G4g3. Lean favor/opp abortn when child gender 'wrong' [NEW] | **NEW** | **X** | **X** |
| **G4gx** | G4gx. SUMMARY: ABORTION WHEN CHILD GENDER 'WRONG' [NEW] | **NEW** | **X** | **X** |
| **G5a** | G5a. Dem PC abortion: fav/opp if nonfatal health risk [NEW] | **NEW** | | |
| **G5a1** | G5a1. Dem PC favor abortion if nonfatal health risk [NEW] | **NEW** | **X** | **X** |
| **G5a2** | G5a2. Dem PC opp abortion if nonfatal health risk [NEW] | **NEW** | **X** | **X** |
| **G5a3** | G5a3. Dem PC lean abortion if nonfatal health risk [NEW] | **NEW** | **X** | **X** |
| **G5b** | G5b. Dem PC abortn: fav/opp when child gender 'wrong' [NEW] | **NEW** | | |
| **G5b1** | G5b1. Dem PC favor abortion when child gender 'wrong' [NEW] | **NEW** | **X** | **X** |
| **G5b2** | G5b2. Dem PC oppose abortion when child gender 'wrong' [NEW] | **NEW** | **X** | **X** |
| **G5b3** | G5b3. Dem PC lean abortion when child gender 'wrong' [NEW] | **NEW** | **X** | **X** |
| **G6a** | G6b. Rep PC abortn: fav/opp when child gender 'wrong' [NEW] | **NEW** | | |
| **G6a** | G6a. Rep PC abortion: fav/opp if nonfatal health risk [NEW] | **NEW** | | |
| **G6a1** | G6a1. Rep PC favor abortion if nonfatal health risk [NEW] | **NEW** | **X** | **X** |
| **G6a1** | G6b1. Rep PC favor abortion when child gender 'wrong' [NEW] | **NEW** | **X** | **X** |
| **G6a2** | G6b2. Rep PC oppose abortion when child gender 'wrong' [NEW] | **NEW** | **X** | **X** |
| **G6a2** | G6a2. Rep PC opp abortion if nonfatal health risk [NEW] | **NEW** | **X** | **X** |
| **G6a3** | G6a3. Rep PC lean abortion if nonfatal health risk [NEW] | **NEW** | **X** | **X** |
| **G6a3** | G6b3. Rep PC lean abortion when child gender 'wrong' [NEW] | **NEW** | **X** | **X** |
| **H4a** | H4a. Ever discuss politics with family or friends [OLD] | **OLD** | | |
| **H4a1** | H4a1. Days in past week discussed politics [OLD] | **OLD** | | |
| **H4b** | H4b. Days in typical week discusses politics [NEW] | **NEW** | | |
| **H5a** | H5a. How much white/black cands better suited to be elected | | **X** | **X** |
| **H6a** | H6a. How much white/black intell better for elected offic | | **X** | **X** |
| **K1a1** | K1a1. BLACK Rs: amt life affected by what happens to blacks | | **X** | **X** |
| **K1b1** | K1b1. HISPANIC Rs: amt life affect by what happens to Hisps | | **X** | **X** |
| **M1a1** | M1a1. How often trust govt in Wash to do what is right [OLD] | **OLD** | **X** | **X** |
| **M1a2** | M1a2. How oft trust govt in Wash to make fair decision [NEW] | **NEW** | **X** | **X** |
| **M1c** | M1c. Does government waste much tax money | | **X** | **X** |
| **M1d** | M1d. How many in government are crooked | | **X** | **X** |
| **M2a1** | M2a1. Politics/govt too complicatd to understand [VERSION C] | **C** | | |
| **M2a2** | M2a2. Good understanding of political issues [VERSION C] | **C** | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **M2a3** | M2a3. Publ officials dont care what people think [VERSION C] | **C** | | |
| **M2a4** | M2a4. Have no say about what govt does [VERSION C] | **C** | | |
| **M2b1** | M2b1. Politics/govt too complicatd to understand [VERSION D] | **D** | | |
| **M2b2** | M2b2. Good understanding of political issues [VERSION D] | **D** | | |
| **M2b3** | M2b3. Publ officials don't care what peopl think [VERSION D] | **D** | | |
| **M2b4** | M2b4. Have no say about what govt does [VERSION D] | **D** | | |
| **M3a1** | M3a1. Public officials don't care [VERSION OLD] | **OLD** | | |
| **M3a2** | M3a2. Public officials don't care [VERSION NEW] | **NEW** | | |
| **M3b** | M3b. Elections make govt pay attention [VERSION NEW] | **NEW** | **X** | **X** |
| **P1a** | P1a. Does R have opinions about many, some or few things | | **X** | **X** |
| **P4** | P4. How much can people change the kind of person they are | | **X** | **X** |
| **P5** | P5. How likely is an earthly catastrophe in next 100 years | | **X** | **X** |
| **Q11** | Q11. Were there major differences between Pres cands | | **X** | **X** |
| **Q12** | Q12. How closely did R follow the election campaign | | **X** | **X** |
| **Q13** | Q13. How satisfied with way democracy works in the U.S. | | **X** | **X** |
| **R2a** | R2a. How likely is R to: join in a protest march or rally | | **X** | **X** |
| **R2b** | R2b. How likely is R to: attend a city or school board meetg | | **X** | **X** |
| **R2c** | R2c. How likely is R to: sign internet petition about issue | | **X** | **X** |
| **R2d** | R2d. How likely is R to: sign paper petition about issue | | **X** | **X** |
| **R2e** | R2e. How likely is R to: give money to religious organizatn | | **X** | **X** |
| **R2f** | R2f. How likely is R to: give money to social/polit organizn | | **X** | **X** |
| **R2g** | R2g. How likely is R to: attend meetg abt social/polit issue | | **X** | **X** |
| **R2h** | R2h. How likely is R to: invite other to social/polit meetg | | **X** | **X** |
| **R2j** | R2j. How likely is R to: distribute social/polit group info | | **X** | **X** |
| **R3a** | R3a. US adults have ever: joined a protest march or rally | | **X** | **X** |
| **R3b** | R3b. US adults have ever: attended city/school brd meeting | | **X** | **X** |
| **R3c** | R3c. US adults have ever: signed internet petition on issue | | **X** | **X** |
| **R3d** | R3d. US adults have ever: signed paper petition on issue | | **X** | **X** |
| **R3e** | R3e. US adults have ever: gave money to religious organizn | | **X** | **X** |
| **R3f** | R3f. US adults have ever: gave money to social/polit org | | **X** | **X** |
| **R3g** | R3g. US adults have ever: attended meetg on soc/polit issue | | **X** | **X** |
| **R3h** | R3h. US adults have ever: invited other to soc/polit meetg | | **X** | **X** |
| **R7a1** | R7a1. How much approve handling of war in Afghanistan | | **X** | **X** |
| **R7a2** | R7a2. How much disapprove handling of war in Afghanistan | | **X** | **X** |
| **R7b1** | R7b1. How much approve handling of war in Iraq | | **X** | **X** |
| **R7b2** | R7b2. How much disapprove handling of war in Iraq | | **X** | **X** |

| | | | |
|---|---|:---:|:---:|
| **R7c1** | R7c1. How much approve efforts to reduce terrorism | X | X |
| **R7c2** | R7c2. How much disapprove efforts to reduce terrorism | X | X |
| **S2a1** | S2a1. How much more crime in city compared to 1 year ago | X | X |
| **S2a2** | S2a2. How much less crime in city compared to 1 year ago | X | X |
| **S2b1** | S2b1. How much more crime in U.S. compared to 1 year ago | X | X |
| **S2b2** | S2b2. How much less crime in U.S. compared to 1 year ago | X | X |
| **S3a1** | S3a1. How much more chance of terrorist attack than 1 yr ago | X | X |
| **S3a2** | S3a2. How much less chance of terrorist attack than 1 yr ago | X | X |
| **S3b** | S3b. Likely terrorist attack killing 100 or more in next yr | X | X |
| **S3c** | S3c. How well govt reduced chance terror attack in last yr | X | X |
| **S4a1** | S4a1. How much increase terror chance: cut oil imports | X | X |
| **S4a2** | S4a2. How much decrease terror chance: cut oil imports | X | X |
| **S4b2** | S4b1.How much increase terror chance: MidEast democracy | X | X |
| **S4b3** | S4b2.How much decrease terror chance: MidEast democracy | X | X |
| **S4c1** | S4c1. How much increase terror chance: stop nuclear weapons | X | X |
| **S4c2** | S4c2. How much decrease terror chance: stop nuclear weapons | X | X |
| **S4d1** | S4d1. How much increase terror chance: more military money | X | X |
| **S4d2** | S4d2. How much decrease terror chance: more military money | X | X |
| **S4e1** | S4e1. How much increase terror chance: aid MidEast poverty | X | X |
| **S4e2** | S4e2. How much decrease terror chance: aid MidEast poverty | X | X |
| **S4f1** | S4f1. How much increase terror chance: stay out others probs | X | X |
| **S4f2** | S4f2. How much decrease terror chance: stay out others probs | X | X |
| **S4g1** | S4g1. How much increase terror chance: stop entrance to US | X | X |
| **S4g2** | S4g2. How much decrease terror chance: stop entrance to US | X | X |
| **S4h1** | S4h1. How much increase terror chance: stop plane boarding | X | X |
| **S4h2** | S4h2. How much decrease terror chance: stop plane boarding | X | X |
| **S4j1** | S4j1. How much increase terror chance: stop weapons to US | X | X |
| **S4j2** | S4j2. How much decrease terror chance: stop weapons to US | X | X |
| **S4k1** | S4k1. How much increase terror chance: strengthen allies | X | X |
| **S4k2** | S4k2. How much decrease terror chance: strengthen allies | X | X |
| **S4m1** | S4m1. How much increase terror chance: helping US exports | X | X |
| **S4m2** | S4m2. How much decrease terror chance: helping US exports | X | X |
| **S4n1** | S4n1. How much increase terror chance: easier to move to US | X | X |
| **S4n2** | S4n2. How much decrease terror chance: easier to move to US | X | X |
| **S5a** | S5a. Likelihood terrorist attack: suicide bombing | X | X |
| **S5b** | S5b. Likelihood terrorist attack: non-suicide bombing | X | X |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| S5c | S5c. Likelihood terrorist attack: radioactive material | | X | X |
| S5d | S5d. Likelihood terrorist attack: nuclear bomb | | X | X |
| S5e | S5e. Likelihood terrorist attack: sniper attack | | X | X |
| S5f | S5f. Likelihood terrorist attack: biologic weapons | | X | X |
| S5g | S5g. Likelihood terrorist attack: chemical weapons | | X | X |
| S5h | S5h. Likelihood terrorist attack: other type of attack | | X | X |
| S6a | S6a. How much favor torture for suspected terrorists | | X | X |
| S6b | S6b. How much oppose torture for suspected terrorists | | X | X |
| T1a | T1a. Was R proud learning Obama won Democratic nomination | 1A,1B | | |
| T1a1 | T1a1. How proud was R learning Obama won Dem nomination | 1A,1B | | |
| T1b | T1b. Was R angry learning Obama won Democratic nomination | 1A,1B | | |
| T1b1 | T1b1. How angry was R learning Obama won Dem nomination | 1A,1B | | |
| T1c | T1c. Was R disappointed learning Obama won Dem nomination | 1A,1B | | |
| T1c1 | T1c1. How disappointed was R learning Obama won Dem nominatn | 1A,1B | | |
| T1d | T1d. Was R afraid learning Obama won Democratic nomination | 1A,1B | | |
| T1d1 | T1d1. How afraid was R learning Obama won Dem nomination | 1A,1B | | |
| T1e | T1e. Was R happy learning Obama won Democratic nomination | 1A,1B | | |
| T1e1 | T1e1. How happy was R learning Obama won Dem nomination | 1A,1B | | |
| T1f | T1f. Was R hopeful learning Obama won Democratic nomination | 1A,1B | | |
| T1f1 | T1f1. How hopeful was R learning Obama won Dem nomination | 1A,1B | | |
| T2 | T2. Why does R think Obama won Democratic nomination | 1A | | |
| T3 | T3. Why does R think Hillary Clinton lost Dem nomination (3 sample) | 1B | | |
| T4a | T4a. Was R proud learning Obama won the Pres election | 2A,2B | | |
| T4a1 | T4a1. How proud was R learning Obama won the Pres election | 2A,2B | | |
| T4b | T4b. Was R angry learning Obama won the Pres election | 2A,2B | | |
| T4b1 | T4b1. How angry was R learning Obama won the Pres election | 2A,2B | | |
| T4c | T4c. Was R disappointed learning Obama won the Pres election | 2A,2B | | |
| T4c1 | T4c1. How disappointed was R learning Obama won Pres electn | 2A,2B | | |
| T4d | T4d. Was R afraid learning Obama won the Pres election | 2A,2B | | |
| T4d1 | T4d1. How afraid was R learning Obama won the Pres election | 2A,2B | | |
| T4e | T4e. Was R happy learning Obama won the Pres election | 2A,2B | | |
| T4e1 | T4e1. How happy was R learning Obama won the Pres election | 2A,2B | | |
| T4f | T4f. Was R hopeful learning Obama won the Pres election | 2A,2B | | |
| T4f1 | T4f1. How hopeful was R learning Obama won the Pres election | 2A,2B | | |
| T5 | T5. Why does R think Obama won the Presidential election | 2A | | |
| T6 | T6. Why does R think McCain lost the Presidential election (3 sample) | 2B | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Y1a** | Y1a. Is govt economic bailout the right step [VERSION Y1a] | **Y1a** | | |
| **Y1a** | Y1a. Is govt economic bailout the right step [VERSION Y1a] | **Y1a** | | |
| **Y1b** | Y1b. Is govt economic bailout the right step [VERSION Y1b] | **Y1b** | **X** | **X** |
| **Y3a** | Y3a. How much more troops in Iraq in 3 months | | **X** | **X** |
| **Y3b** | Y3b. How much fewer troops in Iraq in 3 months | | **X** | **X** |
| **Y4a** | Y4a. How much favor/oppose withdrawal deadline for troops | | **X** | **X** |
| **Y5a1a** | Y5a1a. How favorable about Democratic Party | | **X** | **X** |
| **Y5a2a** | Y5a2a. How unfavorable about Republican Party | | **X** | **X** |
| **Y5b1a** | Y5b1a. How favorable about Republican Party | | **X** | **X** |
| **Y5b2a** | Y5b2a. How favorable about Republican Party | | **X** | **X** |
| **Y6** | Y6. How often does R put on a show | | **X** | **X** |
| **Y7** | Y7. Would R be a good actor | | **X** | **X** |
| **Y8** | Y8. Is R often the center of attention in a group | | **X** | **X** |
| **Y9** | Y9. How satisfied is R with life | | **X** | **X** |