

American National Election Studies
1980 Merged File

(ICPSR 7763)

Principal Investigators

Warren E. Miller
and the
National Election Studies

Center for Political Studies
University of Michigan

Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research
P.O. Box 1248
Arbor, Michigan 48106

Acknowledgement of Assistance

All manuscripts utilizing data made available through the Consortium should acknowledge that fact as well as identify the original collector of the data. The ICPSR Council urges all users of the ICPSR Data facilities to follow some adaptation of this statement with the parenthesis indicating items to be filled in appropriately or deleted by the individual user.

The data (and tabulations) utilized in this (publication) were made available (in part) by the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. The data were originally collected by the Center for Political Studies of the Institute for Social Research, the University of Michigan, for the National Election Studies, under the overall direction of Warren E. Miller; Maria Elena Sanchez was director of studies in 1980. The data were collected under a grant from the National Science Foundation. Neither the collector of the original data nor the Consortium bear any responsibility for the analyses or interpretations presented here.

In order to provide funding agencies with essential information about the use of archival resources and to facilitate the exchange of information about ICPSR participants' research activities, each user of the ICPSR data facilities is expected to send two copies of each completed manuscript or thesis abstract to the Consortium. Please indicate in the cover letter which data were used.

SPECIAL NOTE ABOUT THE 1980 MERGED FILE CODEBOOK

This codebook was converted to Acrobat .PDF format prior to the renumbering of variables.

Please note that the SAS/SPSS data definition files for these 3 studies have variables renumbered, although the Study codebook does not. Variables have been renumbered in the data definition files to the following format:

2-digit (or 2-char) prefix + 4 digits + [optional] 1-char suffix

In most cases, the prefix consists of a 2-digit representation of the year to which the variable applies. For the 1980 Merged file, the prefix used is "IN" so that the first variable is "VIN0001."

Also, multiple response variables which were previously numbered with suffixes "M1", "M2" etc. are now numbered with suffixes "A", "B", "C" etc., so that (for example) 1948 study variable V14M1 has become V480014A.

The variable name references in the codebook does not include the "V" prefix found in all variable names used within the SAS and SPSS data definition files (.sas and .sps files) as released with Study data.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Volume I:

- I. Introduction to the 1980 Studies
- II. Design of the 1980 Studies
- III. Sampling Information
- IV. Using the 1980 Merged File Dataset
 - 1. The Purpose of the Dataset
 - 2. Contents of the Dataset
 - 3. Structure of the Data File
 - 4. Documentation of Variables
- V. Index of Items
- VI. Codebook
 - 1. Questionnaire Data
 - 2. Field Administration Information
 - 3. Sampling Information
 - 4. Vote Validation Study

IX. Appendices

1. Party/Candidate Master Code
2. 1970 Census Occupation Code
3. 1970 Census Industry Code
4. ICPSR Nationality Code
5. ICPSR State and Country Code
6. Cities with Population 25,000 or Over
7. Newspaper Code
8. Important Problems Code
9. Party Differences Code
10. List of Reports from American National Election
Pilot Study Spring, 1979

X. 1980 Merged Variables: Cross-Referenced List for Individual 1980 Studies

XI. Data Tape

ERRATA -- 1980 MERGED FILE

1. CODEBOOK:

- P. 37b -- Note 4 should read "The Republican Party in Arkansas did not conduct a Presidential primary."
- P. 230 -- (ITEM 826) The last clause in the INAP statement should read "5 or 9 in Item 821" rather than "5, 8-9 in Item 893."
- P. 237 -- (ITEM 852) The last clause in the INAP statement should read "5 or 9 in Item 851" rather than "5 or 9 in Item 531."
- P. 259 -- (ITEM 920) The second to last clause in the INAP statement should read "5 in Item 910 and (P3)" rather than "1 in Item 910 and (P3)."

2. SAMPLING INFORMATION:

- P. 37 -- The codes for Texas should begin with "49041 Coke."
- P. 43 -- Code 1 should read "Northeast" rather than "Northwest"; in code 4 the frequency for (C3) should be "275" rather than "175."

3. FREQUENCY ADDENDUM:

Variables 1022, 1024, and 1026 are missing the frequencies for code 3. The data contains the correct values for these variables.

4. PARTY/CANDIDATE CODE

- P. 15 -- There should be codes "960" and "961" in the public power codes. 960 --pro 961 --anti

I. INTRODUCTION

The 1980 studies were conducted by the Center for Political Studies of the Institute for Social Research, the University of Michigan, under the overall direction of Warren E. Miller and under the auspices of a National Science Foundation grant (No. SOC77-08885) which provides long-term support for the national election studies.

The 1980 studies were an ambitious project consisting of eight integrated survey data collections which occurred at strategically-chosen periods in the course of the 1980 calendar year. Additionally, a limited amount of contextual data was gathered, including validation of electoral participation and registration status for all survey participants in 1980. Section II of this document, entitled "Design of the 1980 studies," provides details about the overall study design.

The formulation of the design started Summer, 1978, with a workshop that brought together the CPS project staff, members of the NES Board of Overseers, and a group of scholars representing broad interests.¹ A stimulus memorandum on 1980 design options was mailed to the scholarly community in the aftermath of the workshop to elicit further ideas on design and content. In the months that followed, the study design was further specified and revised to achieve its present form.

As part of research and development efforts sponsored by the NES Board,² several conferences and workshops were held in 1977-1979 to explore innovation in content and measurement for the 1980 studies. Four areas were targeted for special attention: partisanship and party-related matters; the measurement of voter attitudes and salience concerning issues of public policy; new content concerning public perceptions of and responses to political leadership; and the exploration of social networks in the crystallization of the vote choice. Substantive considerations from the various conferences and workshops, as well as suggestions made by scholars who submitted memoranda in connection with these meetings, culminated in the planning and execution of a national

¹The group of scholars invited to participate in the Summer, 1978 workshop were: John H. Aldrich, Richard A. Brody, Steven H. Chaffee, Jack Dennis, Lutz Erbring, John H. Kessel, Donald R. Kinder, Richard G. Niemi, and Herbert F. Weisberg. Philip E. Converse, M. Kent Jennings, and Arthur H. Miller from the Center for Political Studies also attended the meetings.

²Board members during the 1980 planning phase include: Heinz Eulau, Chair, Stanford University; Richard F. Fenno, Jr., University of Rochester; John E. Jackson, University of Pennsylvania; David R. Mayhew, Yale University; Warren E. Miller, University of Michigan, ex officio; Benjamin I. Page, University of Chicago; Mildred A. Schwartz, University of Illinois, Chicago Circle; David O. Sears, University of California, Los Angeles; J. Merrill Shanks, University of California, Berkeley; and John Sprague, Washington University.

pilot study in Spring, 1979, to test alternative instrumentation options.³ Results from the Pilot Study have informed substantive decisions and innovations in 1980 study contents. The final recommendations made by the participants in the Pilot Study appear in reports based on the analyses of those data. These reports are listed in Appendix K.

The NES Board established a 1980 Presidential Elections Committee consisting of three Board members (Merrill Shanks, Chairman; John Jackson, David Sears) and three scholars who participated in the R&D work (Richard A. Brody, Jack Dennis, Donald R. Kinder). This committee along with the CPS project staff was responsible for the planning of the year-long study and the specifications of the 1980 instrumentation in collaboration with the Board.

The Board was responsible for the definition of core questionnaire items to support the national elections time series. Prior to the final selection of items, a memorandum was sent to the approximately 700 persons on the NES mailing list in order to inform the user community about the priority which the Board had assigned to each of the core questions reviewed for inclusion in the Fall presidential election study. The memorandum urged constituents to review the Board decisions and provide feedback if necessary. Researchers interested in the continuation of items designated as low priority had, therefore, the opportunity to contact the Board and justify their need for inclusion. The NES Board was also responsible for reviewing the instrumentation proposed by the Standing Committee on Congressional Elections Research (SCCER). The Board had mandated this body with the definition of core items for a beginning congressional elections time series. Following recommendations from SCCER, the Board approved the repetition in the traditional post-election survey of a substantial number of items that had been used for the first time in the NES/CPS American National Election Study, 1978.

II. DESIGN OF THE 1980 STUDIES

Evolution of the 1980 studies' design resulted in the specification of eight discrete data collections. Interviews were taken with samples of citizens of voting age as of November 4, 1980, living within the coterminous United States. As in 1978, congressional districts constitute the primary sampling areas and the Washington, D.C. area is not represented in the national sample. The elements of the 1980 data collections are depicted in schematic form in Figure 1.

Four of the data collections involve a year-long panel. The panel began in late January as a national cross-section of 1008 cases (approximately nine per congressional district in our national sample of 108 CDs). The timing of

³The major contributors to the Pilot Study were: Robert P. Abelson, John H. Aldrich, Richard A. Brody, Steven H. Chaffee, Peter Clarke, Jack Dennis, Lutz Erbring, Heinz Eulau, Susan Fiske, John E. Jackson, Richard S. Katz, Donald R. Kinder, Richard R. Lau, Arthur H. Miller, Richard G. Niemi, George B. Rabinowitz, David W. Rohde, David O. Sears, J. Merrill Shanks, and Herbert F. Weisberg.

this cross-section was bounded on the early side by the need for a two-week period for interviewer training in early January and on the late side by the occurrence of the New Hampshire primary on February 26. Respondents from this first data collection (hereafter designated as P-1) were reinterviewed in June immediately after the last set of primary elections which were held on June 3. 843 respondents were interviewed in this element of the design (hereafter designated P-2). The third panel interview, P-3, was taken during the month of September, when 769 respondents were reinterviewed. The fourth and final panel interview was taken immediately after the election. This element, P-4, consists of 764 cases, including reinterviews taken with panel respondents who did not participate at P-3 time. In P-4 respondents were administered a fifteen-minute telephone interview covering mainly their vote preferences and participation in the election campaign. (This interview was conducted in person for panel respondents who had no telephone.) Every effort was made to ensure a high response rate by following all panel members who changed residence in the course of the study period.

A fifth component of the design consists of an independent cross-section sample of 965 cases (hereafter designated C-1) who were interviewed in the midst of the primary season during the three-week "window" following the early April primaries. They were reinterviewed following the election with a telephone interview essentially the same as that administered to P-4 respondents. 818 cases make up this reinterview (C-4), the sixth component of the study. (The reinterview was conducted in person for approximately 7% of the C-1 respondents who either had no phone, had refused the number, or had to be tracked down in person.)

The seventh and eighth components are the traditional pre-post time series components. The pre-election interview (C-3) was taken with 1614 cases (approximately 15 per congressional district). The eighth component (C3po) consists of post-election reinterviews with the pre-election sample. 1408 cases were successfully reinterviewed, giving an 87 percent reinterview rate.

The last data collection took place January-February, 1981, when the Vote Validation Study was conducted. Interviewers went to electoral offices throughout the nation to establish whether the respondents were registered to vote in 1980 and, if registered, whether they had visited the polls to vote on Election Day. 1980 election results were also collected at the time for the precincts represented in the sample, as well as sample ballots for the districts and a copy of electoral eligibility rules.

A previously announced cross-section survey (C-2) was cancelled. It had been scheduled for administration in July-August between the national conventions.

The design, therefore, includes interviews with 3587 different respondents. For those variables that do not change in any significant way during the course of the year, this will make it possible to pyramid individual samples for an average of 33 cases per congressional district. Given the reinterviews of the panel and cross-section components, the design calls for a total of some 8,200 interviews in the course of the year.

FIGURE 1

National Election Studies
Center for Political Studies

DESIGN FOR 1980 DATA COLLECTIONS

April 1981

1981

	1980 Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.
<u>[PANEL SAMPLES]</u>													
<u>MAJOR PANEL</u>	<-P-1-->					P-2			<-P-3-->		P-4		
Cases	1008					843			769 [#]		764 ^{*‡}		
	Full National Cross-Section; Year-long Major Panel, First Wave					Second Major Panel Interviews			Third Major Panel Interviews		Fourth Major Panel Interviews		
<u>MINOR PANEL</u>				C-1							c-4		
Cases				965							818*		
				Full National Cross-Section; Minor Panel, First Wave							Second Minor Panel Interviews		
<u>TRADITIONAL TIME-SERIES</u>									<-C-3-->		<-c-3po->		
Cases									1614		1408		
									Full National Cross-Section; Time Series Panel, First (PRE) Wave		Second (POST) Time Series Panel Interviews		
TOTAL	1008			965		843			2383		2990		
<u>[CROSS-SECTION SAMPLES]</u>													
Cases	(P-1)			(C-1)					(C-3)				
	New Cross-Section			New Cross-Section					New Cross-Section				

[ANCILLARY COLLECTIONS]

* Telephone reinterviews

‡ Includes reinterviews with P-1 respondents who did not participate in preceding wave.

Respondents' Registration and Vote Validation: 1980 Election Returns

The 1980 design departs from past election studies in that we did not supplement panel interviews (P-2, P-3, P-4, C-3po, and C-4) through updating a sample of households by replacing moving panel members (who changed residence) with new respondents from these vacated dwelling units. In past panel studies (1956-58-60 and 1972-74-76) we did treat the sample in each year as a sample of residents of a sample of dwelling units. In 1980 we changed slightly the conceptual definition of the universe being studied. It consists simply of all persons residing in the contiguous 48 states who were able to qualify as electors as of November 4, 1980. This includes all persons who expected to be citizens of voting age by that date. With this definition the universe could change in the course of the year only through death, or, in a handful of cases, loss of eligibility by virtue of criminal conviction or institutionalization. The question of whether or not a person changed residence during the year was not considered relevant to their inclusion in the universe to be sampled. From this perspective, selecting any new respondents from dwelling units vacated by panel members who moved became inappropriate. All of those ultimately eligible for the 1980 study had a known probability of inclusion in the study at the time the samples were drawn; new respondents could have been added to the study to replace panel movers only if they had been given a second chance of selection, solely because they had moved into a sample dwelling unit. We avoided this. This redefinition of the universe is conceptually sound and administratively useful because it simplified field operations.

The sample selections for the year-long panel study were initially divided into first-half and second-half samples. This sample differentiation was ignored when P-1 and P-2 went into the field in favor of maximizing the efficiency of those data collections. However, the third panel interviews (P-3) were administered as two random halves; the first half was interviewed in early September, the second in late September.

The third independent cross-section, C-3 (the pre-election time series element) was split into four national segments. A first national segment was interviewed in early September, at the same time as the first half of P-3. A second segment was interviewed in late September, at the same time as the second half of P-3. A third national segment was interviewed during the first half of October, with the fourth and last element of C-3 interviewed in late October. The administration of the C-3 sample in the form of four successive national subsets allowed for continuous monitoring of electorate feelings throughout the Fall campaign period.

The segmentation of the C-3 sample also permits the complete overlap of P-3 with the new cross-sections in September, permitting an assessment of contamination introduced into the panel as a result of prior interviews. Also, assuming minimal bias as a result of panel mortality, it permits the pyramiding of P-3 and the first two components of C-3 to form a larger September sample. The October cross-section consists of a national sample with approximately 950 cases resulting from the last two subsets of the C-3 sample.

Summarized information about the field administration for each of the 1980 study samples (sample size, response rate, etc.) is presented in Table 1 (page 6).

TABLE 1

	SAMPLE ID (ASSIGNED FIELD DATES)	TYPE OF INTERVIEW AVG. LENGTH. MINUTES)	REINTERVIEW RATE	SAMPLE SIZE BY WAVE	COMPLETED INTERVIEWS		NON-INTERVIEWS	
					On Time	Late	EFUSAL	OTHER NON-INT
A. Year-Long Panel Study	P-1 (Jan 22-Feb 25)	Personal (60.5)	(100.0%)	1351	1008 (74.6%)		240 (17.87%)	103 (7.6%)
	P-2 (June 4-July 13)	Personal Reinterview (59.3)	83.6%	1008	843 (83.6)		104 (10.3)	\$1)
	(Sept 2-Oct 1)	Personal Reinterview (70.7)	76.3%	866 *	769 (88.8)		(?7)	(3305)
	1st Half:9/1-9/16 2nd Half:9/17-10/1				331 355	43 40		
	P-4 (Nov 5-Nov 25)	Telephone Reinterview (15.8)	75.8%	822 *	764 (92.9)		29 (3.5)	29 (3.5)
B. Minor Panel	C-1 (April 2-May 2)	Personal (68.0)	(100.0%)	1307	965 (73.8)		215 (16.4)	127 (9.7)
	c-4 (Nov 5-Nov 26)	Telephone Reinterview (17.0)	84.8%	965	818 (84.8)		66 (6.8)	81 (8.4)
C. Traditional Time-Series Presidential Election Study	C-3 (Pre) (Sept 2 -Nov 3)	Personal (70.1)	(100.0%)	2249	1614 (71.8)		468 (20.8)	167 (7.4)
	Subset A:9/2-9/16 Subset B:9/17-10/1 Subset C:10/2-10/1 Subset D:10/17-11/				267 266 407 467	59 47 84 17		
	c-3Po (Post) (Nov 5-Dec 17)	Personal Reinterview (60.1)	87.2%	1614	1408 (87.2)		141 (8.7)	(?0)

* Includes reinterviews with respondents who had not participated in the immediately preceding wave, but had granted an interview at P-1 time.

111. SAMPLING INFORMATION

Data for the 1980 studies were obtained by interviewing in person, and over the telephone, persons living in households in coterminous United States, exclusive of households on military reservations and those in the District of Columbia. The eligible population consisted of United States citizens who would be 18 years of age or older by Election Day, 1980.

The present study employs a sampling frame of congressional districts previously used to obtain the sample for the NES/CPS American National Election Study, 1978. These 108 congressional districts comprise the primary sampling areas. They were selected in the first stage of the multi-stage area probability sample developed in 1978. At that time, the universe of 432 eligible congressional districts was divided into 108 strata, each containing four congressional districts of roughly comparable characteristics that included, insofar as possible, homogeneity with respect to geographic region, state, urbanization, and recent voting behavior. From each of the 108 strata, one district was then selected with probability of selection in proportion to the 1975 estimated population to yield the 108 congressional districts in the sampling frame.

In the next stages of selection, sample areas were obtained within each of the sample districts. When the congressional district was part of a major city, a sample of blocks was distributed throughout the district. In the case of districts that comprised several counties, generally one or two counties were selected and, within the sample counties, about 10 or 12 city or town blocks and segments of rural areas were drawn. A selection of housing units for the current study was made from updated lists of housing units within such sample blocks and segments.

At the overall rate of 1:11,200 a sample of approximately 7,500 housing units was drawn for use throughout the year-long monitoring cycle. These are the dwellings where interviewers called at designated times in 1980 to attempt interviews with one objectively selected eligible person. The selections were thinly spread, averaging only one or two from a sample block. In households with eligible persons, an interview was completed with the household member designated as the respondent through an objective selection procedure allowing for no substitutions.

Three-fourteenths of the sample selections were assigned to the January-February (P-1) interviewing period, another 3/14 to the April (C-1) study and 5/14 to the traditional Fall (C-3) pre-election survey. The balance of the sample selections (3/14), originally intended for the later canceled July (C-2) study and as a potential sample supplement in the Fall, were never used.

Special Information About the P-3 and the C-3 (Pre-Election) Samples

The C-3 sample selections were scientifically divided into four national subsets to be administered during September and October in consecutive interviewing periods spanning two weeks each. The P-3 sample selections were likewise subdivided into two national halves to be interviewed during September.

The first two administration periods in C-3 overlapped with the administration dates of the first and second halves of P-3, respectively.

Most of the personal interviews were successfully completed within the targeted time frame. Late interviews for any given administration period in P-3 and C-3 were generally completed in the week immediately following the targeted period, the so-called "grace period." Some interviews, however, were completed later than this for a variety of reasons involving, among other things, the respondent's unavailability at the appropriate time. See Item 1023 (V2070-V2071) for a detailed breakdown.

Late Interviews for the two primary areas (congressional districts TX03 and CA29) represent unusual and unfortunate circumstances. Midway during the C-3po post-election survey, the Field Office verified that all C-3 pre-election interviews in these two areas, and P-3 interviews in T X 03 , had been fabricated by the area interviewer. To recover some of the missed pre-election information, including demographic data, a shortened pre-election interview was conducted with the legitimate respondents at the time they were contacted for the postelection administration.

The number of C-3 sample selections in TX03 was much larger than in CA29; field work in the Texas district could not have been successfully completed unless the interviewing load were reduced. Accordingly, a random half-sample was drawn from the original TX03 sample selections for C-3, and only these respondents were contacted at post-election time. Weighting to compensate for this subsampling done in TX03 was handled by duplicating the data records of the respondents in the targeted half-sample. This procedure made it unnecessary to resort to a weight variable for correction purposes.

The (P-3 and C-3) pre-election case ID's of the respondents in TX03 and CA29 and the case ID's for the duplicate TX03 records in the C-3 sample are as follows:

	<u>C-3 Case ID</u> (V2004)	<u>P-3 Case ID</u> (V2004)
TX03	1701-1715 (random-half) 1751-1765 (duplicate cases)	3801-3817
CA29	1716-1729	--_

FILE STRUCTURE

The data have been fully processed and cleaned. Inconsistencies, where found, have been resolved by comparison with the original questionnaires. An index of items has been provided to facilitate the location of variables of interest to the user. Frequencies are included for most variables in the addendum in volume 2.

IV. USING THE 1980 MERGED FILE

1. THE PURPOSE OF THE DATASET. Nine distinct studies--eight surveys and the Vote Validation Study--were conducted between January, 1980 and February, 1981. Three independent national samples were used in the course of the eight surveys.

The first national sample was designated a year-long panel study. The first interview with this sample of respondents took place January-February, 1980 (P-1 study), followed thereafter with reinterviews in June (P-2 study), September (P-3 study), and November (P-4 study).

The second national sample was first interviewed in April (C-1 study) and reinterviewed once thereafter in November (C-4 study).

The third national sample consists of respondents interviewed for the first time during September-October (C-3 study) and reinterviewed once thereafter during November-December (C-3po study). This is the traditional pre-and post-presidential election study.

The cycle of data collections in 1980 generated a large volume of data, raising the question of how best to organize the data files to simplify the analytic phase. Five analytic goals had directed the planning and design of the 1980 study. These goals, briefly defined below, were guiding principles in the ultimate structure chosen for the 1980 Merged File. A deliberate attempt was made to construct the 1980 Merged File in such a manner that the analytic goals for the project could be optimally realized.

The analytic goals were as follows:

- 1- panel analyses involving primarily the sample of respondents who are part of the year-long panel (P-1/P-2/P-3/P-4)
- 2- analyses of variable aggregate change over time in which the changes in a variable over time are monitored by comparing results across the three different national samples interviewed at different times in the course of the election year
- 3- assessment of panel contamination resulting from the comparison of answers given by previously-interviewed panel respondents (P-3) to answers from a new and uncontaminated sample of respondents (C-3, first half) who were administered identical questions over the same time period spanned by the panel administration
- 4- pooling of respondents across national samples to increase the sample size by combining two or more independent samples for analyses of specific items (e.g., analyzing the political participation of black respondents in the three samples, treating these black respondents as one group)

- 5- assessment of telephone interview vs. personal interview method effects by comparing the results obtained for identical questions administered at a comparable time period, but using different interviewing techniques across samples. P-4 and C-4 respondents received a post-election telephone reinterview, whereas C-3po respondents answered the same questions in the course of their post-election personal interview.

All of these objectives have been optimized in the design and construction of the 1980 Merged File. The following pages discuss how to use the file and interpret the documentation properly. It is necessary to read the description carefully.

Maria Sanchez designed and supervised the production of the 1980 Merged File dataset. Celinda Lake and Bill McGee were in charge of data management and file-building activities; Alice Hayes and Marlene Smith were responsible for the documentation; and Julio Borquez, Edward Lisefski, and Nathan Upfall assisted with various phases of the project. Charles Franklin had responsibility for the Vote Validation Study.

2. CONTENTS OF THE DATASET. All of the data gathered during the year-long 1980 data collection cycle are included in the Merged Dataset with the following exceptions:

Questions Omitted from Dataset

<u>Study</u>	<u>Q#</u>	<u>Contents</u>
c-3po only	L4-L9 L11-L14 L17-L21	Vote choice/preference for the following races: House, Senate, Governor; split-ticket voting
c-3po only	H5-H24; J10	Congressional time series: candidate evaluation, likes/dislikes, etc., about congressional candidates
c-3po only	G5; Section R	Congressional time series; placement of House and Senate candidates on feeling thermometer, liberal-conservative scale and issue scales

These data have been released as part of the American National Election Study, 1980 -Traditional Time Series (C-3/C-3po Surveys)

3. STRUCTURE OF THE DATA FILE. The three national samples used in 1980 constitute the primary building blocks of the Merged File. Each of these samples defines a region or stratum of records in the actual data file and may be selected using V2001.

Questionnaire Data: ITEM 1-986 (V2-V1755)

Field	ITEM 1001 (V1)	ITEM 1005 (V1756-1759)
Administration	ITEMS 1002-1003 (V2001-V2005)	ITEMS 1006-1028 (V2006-V2076)
Information:	ITEM 1004 (V1760-V1763)	

Sampling Information: ITEMS 2001-2002 (V1764-V1768) ITEMS 2003-2018 (V3001-V3016)

Vote Validation: ITEMS 3001-3012 (V4001-V4012)

V2001 is the filter variable that must be used to retrieve each of the individual national samples comprising a stratum of records in the Merged Data File. National sample #1 data cases have a '1' coded in this variable; national sample #2 data cases are coded '2'; and national sample #3 data cases are coded '3' in this same variable. This same filter variable should be used to pool data cases from different national samples by retrieving jointly two or more of the individual national samples in order to create a larger and combined sample base. (For example, INCLUDE V2001=1, 2).

4. DOCUMENTATION OF VARIABLES. A codebook entry is reproduced below to assist with the interpretation of the documentation.

SAMPLE CODEBOOK ENTRY

	ITEM 1			A1. Some people don't pay much attention to political campaigns. How about you? Would you say that you have been (were) very much interested, somewhat interested, or not much interested in following the political campaigns (so far) this year.
v1	v2	v3	v4	
p1	p2	p3	p4	
c1			c4	
c3		(c3)	C3PO	
				1. VERY MUCH INTERESTED
				3. SOMEWHAT INTERESTED
				5. NOT MUCH INTERESTED
				8. DK
				@9. NA

The textual portion to the right of the box reports the wording of the question administered and the categories used to codify the responses. Each generic question ever asked as part of the year-long 1980 studies is an ITEM in the codebook. For example, Interest in Campaigns, a generic question asked several times throughout the year, has been designated ITEM 1 in the Merged codebook. There are approximately 1060 such generic questions or ITEMS documented in this codebook yielding 1872 variables. ITEMS are organized for presentation according to the broad conceptual groupings defined in the Composite Questionnaire; therefore, the codebook does not reproduce the order in which the questions were originally administered.

Any given ITEM (generic question) typically has several variable numbers associated with it. Variable numbers are reported on the top line of the box entry, above the dotted line. In the example above, ITEM 1 has variables 1-4 associated with it. However, throughout the codebook, the number of variables varies by ITEM. The minimum number of variables for an ITEM is 'one' and, as in the example above, the maximum for any given ITEM is 'four.'

A quick inspection of the box will identify in which survey(s) the question was asked in 1980. By reading across the rows in the body of the box, you will be able to determine the number of times that the ITEM was asked of each national sample. A row in the box corresponds to a national sample (or stratum) in the data file. Thus, reading across the first row, ITEM 1 was administered to the first national sample at P-1, P-2, P-3 and P-4. From the second row in the box, you determine that the second national sample was asked the question twice, at C-1 and C-4. Finally, the third row indicates that the third national sample was also asked the question twice, once in C-3 and again in C-3po. Further, in the data file each respondent in this third national sample will have the answer gathered at C-3 for ITEM 1 entered twice in the data record, once under V1 and again under V3. This duplication of C-3 data is indicated by the notation '(C3)' appearing in the box in the column for Variable 3. The reasons for this manipulation will become apparent in the discussion that follows.

By reading the same box information anchoring this time on the columns instead of the rows, you will learn what type of information is stored in each of the variables associated with ITEM 1. Specifically, the information entered in each of the columns headed by a variable number defines the sample(s) (national sample, 1, 2 and/or 3) to which the question was administered AND the wave or administration period (P-1, C-1, etc.) for the data stored under the particular variable number in the data file.

In the example above, Interest in Campaigns (ITEM 1) was a question asked repeatedly of the various national samples throughout the 1980 study. Variable 1 stores data for the time when ITEM 1 was first administered to each of the national samples, P-1 C-1 C-3. Note that the time of first administration is different for each of the samples. P-1 respondents were interviewed before the primaries had begun, C-1 respondents were interviewed midway during the primary season, and C-3 respondents were interviewed during the Fall campaign period. Variable 1 may thus be conceptualized as monitoring aggregate change for ITEM 1 over time, as the individual samples are retrieved for analyses and sample statistics are obtained for each of them. This type of analyses by strata is easily accommodated by most software packages.

Variable 2 stores the data obtained from panel respondents at P-2 time; this variable record location in the data file is padded with 'missing data' values for the two other national samples, a condition signaled by the presence of blanks in the column designating Variable 2 in the box. The actual value used for padding the data field is identified in the list of codes by the appearance of the symbol '@' by that code value, code 9 in the example above. This flagged code also references the value used to pad the record of respondents who did not participate in reinterview surveys for any of the samples; for example, C-1 respondents who refused to participate at C-4 time are coded 9 in V4.

Variable 3 stores information for two of the national samples: the P-3 or third measurement of ITEM 1 for the year-long panel sample, and the measurement obtained at C-3 for the respondents in the third national sample. The present definition of Variable 3 serves three possible analytic goals: a) panel analyses involving the first national sample only, b) pooling of cases from the first and third national samples to increase the sample size of the Fall pre-election sample, and c) assessment of panel contamination resulting from comparing the answers given by the panel respondents at P-3 time (September) to the answers given at C-3 by respondents in the first half of the third national sample who were administered the identical question also during September. C-3 data from Variable 1 were duplicated in Variable 3 [(C3) notation in box] to meet these analytic goals. As with Variable 2, blanks in the column for Variable 3 indicate that the variable record location in the data file is padded with the flagged (@) 'missing data' value for the second national sample.

Finally, Variable 4 stores the post-election measurement (P-4/C-4/C-3po) of ITEM 1 for the three national samples. Note that in this case and unlike the situation for Variable 1, the observations across samples occurred at comparable time periods. However, the administration methods differed (personal vs. telephone).

6. HOW TO LOCATE AND ACCESS INFORMATION Here is the summary of the steps required to work with the Merged File:

1- The Index of Items in the Merged File (Vol. 1, pink cover-sheet) provides a guide to the contents of the ITEMS in the 1980 American National Election Study. The Table of Contents of the Index is the entry point for using this index and indicates the substantive topics by which the Merged File is organized. The Table of Contents will direct you to the pages in the Index which describe the ITEMS associated with a particular topic, e.g.,

2. VOTING BEHAVIOR AND EVALUATION OF CANDIDATES,.....6

2.1 Pattern of R's Past Voting6

You can then identify the Codebook ITEM numbers for the questions of interest to you.

2- Locate the specific ITEMS in the body of the codebook. (The codebook is organized in ITEM order from ITEM 1 to ITEM 3012.) Using the ITEM documentation box, decide which national sample(s) to use in your analyses and choose the variable number(s) designating the desired time of measurement for the selected national sample(s).

3- Volume II of the Merged File documentation contains frequencies for most of the variables in the dataset. The frequencies addendum is organized by ITEM number, like the codebook, and can be used to verify the accuracy of file setup and file construction at individual user installations as well. as to give an overview of the data in the Merged File. See Volume II, Frequencies Addendum, for further information.

7. WAYS TO SIMPLIFY THE USE OF THE FILE. Bear in mind that there are ways in which the use of the file may be simplified depending on the objectives of your analyses.

1- If you are planning to do panel analyses involving only the first national sample (P-1/P-2/P-3/P-4), you need not work with the entire array of cases in the Merged File and retrieve constantly the sample you happen to be interested in, You would want to retrieve once from the Merged File all of the cases for the first national sample, and write these cases to your own tape or disk file. Thereafter; you would use only the first row in the documentation box associated with each ITEM to access the variables in the new file you have generated,

2- You may feel that the Merged File is error-prone for you because, among other things, you may forget to retrieve the appropriate samples while monitoring aggregate change of variables over time and across samples. To avoid this problem, you could always produce three separate files from the Merged File, Simple retrieve each of the national samples individually and produce three new files that contain one and only one type of sample per file. As you work with the new files, you would use the first, second, or third row of the ITEM

documentation box, depending on which of your new sample files you were using.

- 3- Finally, an individual dataset exists for the 1980 pre-post C-3/C-3po) presidential election study, extending the traditional time-series of American election studies. If you are only interested in that study for teaching or research purposes, you need not work with the Merged File, but should use instead the 1980 Traditional Time Series dataset which has a simpler structure.

INDEX OF ITEMS: 1980 MERGED FILE

INTRODUCTION TO THE INDEX

This Index describes the contents of the items in the 1980 Merged File. The dataset is organized by Item Number, where each Item represents a question asked in one or more of the survey data collections. Each Item has between one and four variables associated with it, each variable containing data for one or more sample waves. For example, Item 1, Interest in Current Campaign, consists of variables 2, 3, 4 and 5. Variable 2 contains data for P1, C1 and C3 for Item 1. Variable 3 contains data for P2, variable 4 contains data for P3 and C3, and variable 5 contains data for P4, C4 and C3P0 for Item 1.

This Index documents the Item Number, associated variable numbers, and the description of the contents of the Item. To determine which sample waves are contained in the variables associated with a particular Item, the user should refer to the body of the codebook or to the Osiris Dictionary listing, where the variable name indicates the sample waves included.

The Index is organized by substantive topics to provide a quick reference to the questions of interest. The substantive classification scheme is summarized in the Table of Contents; the Items included under a topic of interest are detailed in the body of the Index on the pages indicated. The Table of Contents is always the entry point for using the Index.