CODEBOOK INTRODUCTION FILE

AMERICAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES

ANES 1988-1992 Merged Senate File

Principal Investigators

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

ICPSR ARCHIVE NUMBER 9580

BIBLIOGRAPHIC CITATION

Publications based on ICPSR data collections should acknowledge those sources by

means of bibliographic citations. To ensure that such source attributions are captured for social science bibliographic utilities, citations must appear in footnotes or in the reference section of publications. The bibliographic citation for this data collection is:

Miller, Warren E., Donald R. Kinder, Steven J. Rosenstone, and the National Election Studies. AMERICAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY: ANES 1988-1992 MERGED SENATE FILE [Computer file]. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Center for Political Studies [producer], 1993. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 1993.

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION ON USE OF ICPSR RESOURCES

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

DATA DISCLAIMER

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

>> I.A. GENERAL INFORMATION

The NES/CPS senate election studies were conducted in 1988, 1990 and 1992 through the Center for Political Studies of the Institute for Social Research, under the overall direction of Warren E. Miller (1988) and Warren E. Miller, Steven J. Rosenstone and Donald R. Kinder (1990 and 1992). Santa Traugott has been the NES Project Manager during this period. Giovanna Morchio of the NES project staff prepared the 1988 Senate data for its initial release in May, 1989. Thomas Ivacko prepared the second release of the 1988 data, and was study manager for the 1990 and 1992 Senate studies. He also prepared the 1988-1990 pooled dataset, assisted by Fran Eliot, and the 1988-1990-1992 pooled dataset and accompanying documentation, assisted by Joel Bloom. Joel Bloom updated and constructed the 1992 contextual data section for the 1988, 1990, 1992 pooled file. Market Opinion Research carried out the interviews in 1988. Market Strategies, Incorporated, did the interviewing in 1990 and again in 1992. Both firms are based in the metropolitan Detroit area.

The 1988 Senate study was conducted under the auspices of National Science Foundation Grant SES-8341310 providing long-term support for the National Election Studies. The 1990 Senate study was funded by National Science Foundation Grant SES-9009379. The 1992 Senate study was funded by the National Science Foundation Grant SES-9209410.

Since 1978 the NES election studies have been designed by a National Board of Overseers, the members of which meet several times a year to plan content and administration of the major study components. Board members during the planning of these studies included: Morris P. Fiorina, Harvard University, Chair; Richard A. Brody, Stanford University; Stanley Feldman, University of Kentucky; Edie N. Goldenberg, University of Michigan; Mary Jackman, University of California at Davis; Gary C. Jacobson, University of California, San Diego; Stanley Kelley, Jr., Princeton University; Donald R. Kinder, the University of Michigan; David Leege, the University of Notre Dame, F Thomas Mann, The Brookings Institution; Douglas Rivers, the University of California at Los Angeles; Ray Wolfinger, the University of California at Berkeley; Warren E. Miller, Arizona State University, ex officio; and Steven J. Rosenstone, University of Michigan, ex officio.

Planning for the initial Senate Study in 1988 extended over several years and included two rounds of stimulus letters soliciting community input, and a Congressional Elections Workshop (held in Berkeley CA in August of 1985). From this group, a consensus began to emerge which was the basis for the 1988, 1990 and 1992 study designs. The several components of this consensus are:

1) For the comparative study of Senate elections, it was difficult, if not impossible, to pool many separate surveys done by different organizations with different questionnaires, samples and modes of administration. Pooling the National Election Studies over several years was also inadequate as a solution since their sample design led to a concentration of voters in the most populous states.

2) It was important to study citizen reaction to Senators at all phases of their 6-year term. Consequently, the study sample should include states in which there was not a Senate election, and the questionnaires should include questions about Senators whose terms are not up.

3) The study of Senate elections will provide a

unique opportunity to study the impact of context on electoral behavior.

4) Because an important unresolved puzzle in the study of congressional elections was the relationship between House and Senate evaluations and vote choice, any future study should also include House members as well as Senators.

A Standing Committee on Congressional Elections Research was appointed subsequent to the Berkeley meeting. Members were: Jacobson (Chair), Brody, Fenno, Ferejohn, Goldenberg, Mann, Miller, Rivers, Rosenstone, Shanks, and Wolfinger. This committee met twice more, in February of 1986 and January of 1987, to discuss specific plans for the 1988 Senate Study and to discuss the elements of a proposal to NSF for renewed funding for the study of Senate elections in 1989-1993.

The Planning Committee for the 1990 Senate Study consisted of Board members Fiorina, Jacobson, Rivers, Rosenstone, Wolfinger and Zaller. Other members of the Committee included John Alford, Rice University; Charles Franklin, Washington University; Lynn Raggsdale, University of Arizona; and Charles Stewart, Stanford University.

The Planning Committee for the 1992 Senate Study consisted of Board members Jacobson, Rivers, Zaller, Rosenstone, Kinder and Miller. Other members of the Committee included Charles Franklin, University of Wisconsin, and Peverill Squire, University of Iowa.

>> I.B. ANES 1988-1992 MERGED SENATE FILE DATA COLLECTION DESCRIPTION

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

(ICPSR 9580)

SUMMARY:

This dataset is a combination of the 1988, 1990 and 1992 Senate Election Studies. Over the course of 3 elections, we have interviewed voters in each of the 50 states, gathering data on citizen evaluations of all Senators at each stage of their 6-year election cycle. The 1988, 1990 and 1992 Senate Election Studies were planned as waves of a three-part study and thus were very similar in content and design. Where possible, the survey data facilitate the comparison of House and Senate races through the use of questions that generally parallel those questions used in election studies since 1978 concerning respondents' interaction with and evaluation of candidates for the United States House of Representatives. However, because of redistricting in the early 1990's we were unable to pre-identify Congressional Districts for the 1992 respondents. Therefore the survey instrument was redesigned to some degree, cutting some of the House-related content, for the 1992 survey. The 50-states survey design also allows for the comparison of perception and evaluation of Senators who are up for re-election with those in the second or fourth years of

their terms. Topics covered include: respondent's recall and likes/dislikes of House and Senate candidates, issues discussed in the campaigns, contact with House and Senate candidates/incumbents, respondent's opinion of the proper roles for Senators and Representatives, a limited set of issue questions, liberal/conservative self-placement, party identification, media exposure, and demographic information as well as other areas. Contextual data presented include election returns for the Senate primary and general elections, voting indices for the years 1983-1992, information about the Senate campaign such as election outcome predictions, campaign pollster used, spending patterns, and demographic, geographic and economic data for the state. A section of derived measure is offered with reorganized variables (i.e. incumbent vs. challenger, Democrat vs. Republican, etc.).

UNIVERSE:

1988 Cases:	All United States citizens of voting age on or before November 8, 1988, residing in households with telephones in the 50 states.
1990 Cases:	All United States citizens of voting age on or before November 6, 1990, residing in households with telephones in the 50 states. The only citizens with no chance of selection are those with unlisted numbers in a hundred series which has no listed numbers. See Appendix B.
1992 Cases:	All United States citizens of voting age on or before November 3, 1992, residing in households with telephones in the 50 states.

SAMPLING:

1988 Cases:	Two-stage random sample, stratified by state
1990 Cases:	Dual-frame (list and RDD) within each state
1992 Cases:	One-stage, list-assisted RDD with no clustering

NOTE: The contextual data was originally collected for the Board of Overseers by the Contextual Data Committee, chaired by Gary Jacobson and Raymond Wolfinger. Many variables have been updated for the 1990 and 1992 contextual data sections (i.e. election returns, age of candidates/senators, campaign spending and certain state political, demographic, geographic and economic variables.) Certain variables have been padded with missing data (Some mass mailing variables, campaign manager, voting-indices and so on) which could not be found or were not available at the time of release.

>> II.A. CONTENT OF THE SENATE STUDIES

Survey Content

The study content was generally designed to parallel the questions used in the election studies since 1978 about the respondent's interaction with and evaluation of candidates for the U.S. House of Representatives. For both the 1988 and 1990 studies, a major goal was to produce data facilitating the comparison of House and Senate evaluations and races. Redistricting between the 1990 and 1992 studies forced a change in study design, because it was not possible to pre-identify the Congressional District for the 1992 study respondents. Since we could not provide the names of House candidates, the study was redesigned to de-emphasize the House aspects of the study, although certain key questions were retained, such as candidate recall and vote recall. Another desired comparison was the perceptions and evaluations of Senators in states where there was no Senate election with the evaluations and perceptions of Senators running for re-election. This comparison was provided for in all three waves of the study.

The 1988, 1990 and 1992 surveys were 32 minutes, 41 minutes and 34 minutes in length, respectively. Among other areas, respondents were asked about: their recall of House and Senate candidates and of Senators; their likes and dislikes of House and Senate candidates and of Senators (these House-related questions were not asked in 1992); what issues were talked about in the campaigns; campaigns in their state and district (district was not asked in 1992); contact with House and Senate candidates and Senators (these House-related questions were not asked in 1992); respondent-initiated contact with House incumbents and with the running Senate incumbent/the respondent's Senators (these House-related questions were not asked in 1992); the respondent's opinion of proper roles for Senators and Representatives (asked only in 1988 and 1990); a limited set of issue questions; liberal/ conservative self-placement; party identification; media exposure (including newspaper read); and a set of demographic questions.

>> II.B. CANDIDATE SPECIFIC INFORMATION AND QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN

Candidate Specific Information and Questionnaire Design

For the 1988 and 1990 studies, for a given congressional district, there were basically nine possible combinations of House and Senate race types. In this typology at least, house races are of three basic kinds: open (no incumbent); incumbent unopposed; and incumbent with opposition. Districts can be further classified as to whether there was a Senate race in the state and, if so, whether the seat was "open" or was contested by the Senate incumbent.

There were ten sections in each the 1988 and 1990 questionnaires (five for the House and five for the Senate) in which question wording or logic varies, depending upon race type. These sections are: recall of candidates, candidate/incumbent likes and dislikes, contact with candidate/incumbent, respondent-initiated contact, and respondent recall of leadership positions of representatives and senators.

All three surveys were administered by means of PC-based CATI systems. However, the logic required to differentiate between nine race types at ten different places in the 1988 and 1990 questionnaires was so cumbersome as to degrade system performance unacceptably. Accordingly, in both of those years, there were actually multiple CATI applications, consisting of different questionnaire versions corresponding to race type. These "versions" were subsequently, and painstakingly, reassembled. For the 1992 survey, since the major 'House' sections were deleted, only two CATI versions were needed - one for California (because there were two Senate races there), and one for all other states.

Questions pertaining to the House always refer to a candidate; that is, they are not asked about an incumbent who is not a candidate for re-election. When the same questions are asked at the Senate level, they are asked about the candidates in

the Senate race and the Senator whose term is not up, or in states not having a race about both incumbent Senators.

Since 1978, the NES has used a Candidate Number Master Code to distinguish race type situations. This candidate number master code was used in the Senate surveys to pre-load the name of the correct Democratic or Republican candidate/Senator for each race, and to guide the questionnaire logic through the different race types. The candidate number master code is shown in Table 1. In Table 2, we have listed the question number and related candidate number for each of the ten sections of the questionnaire, which are dependent on race type, for all three waves.

TABLE 1: CANDIDATE NUMBER MASTER CODE

U.S. SENATE RACES

STATES WITH NO INCUMBENT RUNNING ('OPEN SEAT')	STATES WITH INCUMBENT RUNNING	STATES WITH NO SENATE RACE
10. THIRD PARTY CAND.	10. THIRD PARTY CAND.	17. DEM. SENATOR
11. DEM. CANDIDATE	13. DEM. INCUMBENT	18. REP. SENATOR
12. REP. CANDIDATE	14. REP. INCUMBENT	27. DEM. SENATOR
	15. DEM. CANDIDATE	28. REP. SENATOR
	16. REP. CANDIDATE	
19. DEM. INCUMBENT, WITH TERM NOT UP	19. DEM. INCUMBENT, WITH TERM NOT UP	
29. REP. INCUMBENT, WITH TERM NOT UP	20. REP. INCUMBENT, WITH TERM NOT UP	
21. DEM. INCUMBENT RETIRING		
22. REP. INCUMBENT RETIRING		

U.S. HOUSE RACES

DISTRICTS WITH NO INCUMBENT REPRESENTATIVE RUNNING ('OPEN SEAT')	DISTRICTS WITH INCUMBENT REPRESENTATIVE RUNNING
30. THIRD PARTY CANDIDATE	30. THIRD PARTY CANDIDATE
31. DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE	33. DEMOCRATIC INCUMBENT
32. REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE	34. REPUBLICAN INCUMBENT
	35. DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE
41. DEMOCRATIC INCUMBENT RETIRING	36. REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE
42. REPUBLICAN INCUMBENT RETIRING	

U.S. GUBERNATORIAL RACES

STATES WITH NO INCUMBENT RUNNING ('OPEN SEAT')	STATES WITH INCUMBENT RUNNING	STATES WITH NO GUBERNATORIAL RACE

50. THIRD PARTY CAND	50. THIRD PARTY CAND.	57. DEM. GOVERNOR
51. DEM. CANDIDATE	53. DEM. INCUMBENT	58. REP. GOVERNOR
52. REP. CANDIDATE	54. REP. INCUMBENT	
	55. DEM. CANDIDATE	
	56. REP. CANDIDATE	
61. DEM. INC. RETIRING		
62. REP. INC. RETIRING		

TABLE 2. CANDIDATE AND QUESTION NUMBER

A. RECALL OF SENATE CANDIDATES (B SERIES)

	Cand.#	Q#
CONTESTED RACES:	11-15	B9-B13
	19,29	B14-B16
NO SENATE RACE:	17,18,27,28	B17-B21

B. RECALL OF HOUSE CANDIDATES

ALL RACES:	30-36	B4-B8

C. LIKES/DISLIKES OF SENATORS/CANDIDATES (D SERIES)

CONTESTED RACE:	11,13,15	D1-D4
	12,14,16	D5-D8
	19,29	D9-D12
NO SENATE RACE:	17,18,27,28	D13-D16
	17,18,27,28	D17-D20

D. LIKES/DISLIKES OF HOUSE CANDIDATES (D SERIES) (Not Asked in 1992)

CONTESTED RACE:	31,33,35	D21-D24
	32,34,36	D25-D28
UNCONTESTED RACE:	33	D21-D24
	34	D25-D28

E. CONTACT WITH SENATE CANDIDATES AND INCUMBENT SENATORS(F SERIES)

INC. CONTESTED RACE:	13,14	F1-F8	
	15,16	F9-F16	
	19,29	F33-F40	
*OPEN RACE:	11	F17-F24	
	12	F25-F32	
	19,29	F33-F40	
NO SENATE RACE:	17,18,27,28	F41-F48	(SENATOR 1)
	17,18,27,28	F49-F56	(SENATOR 2)

F. CONTACT WITH HOUSE CANDIDATES (G SERIES) (Not Asked in 1992)

INC. CONTESTED RACE:	33,34	G1-G8

	35,36	G9-G16
OPEN RACE:	31	G17-G24
	32	G25-G32
UNOPPOSED:	33,34	G1-G8

G. RESPONDENT-INITIATED CONTACT WITH SENATORS AND EVALUATION (J SERIES)

INC. CONTESTED RACE:	13,14	J1-J14	
	19,29	J15-J28	
OPEN RACE:	19,29	J15-J28	
NO RACE:	17,18,27,28	J29-J42	(SENATOR 1)
	17,18,27,28	J43-J56	(SENATOR 2)

H. RESPONDENT INITIATED CONTACT WITH HOUSE INCUMBENTS AND EVALUATION (Not Asked in 1992)

INC. CONTESTED RACE:	33,34	J57-J70
OPEN RACE:	None	None
UNOPPOSED RACE:	33,34	J57-J70

I. LEADERSHIP POSITION OF SENATORS (AND PREVIOUS OFFICE OF CANDS:1990) (Not Asked in 1992)

INC. CONTESTED RACE:	13,14	J71-J72	
	19,29	J73-J74	
	15,16	J81-J82	(1990 only)
OPEN RACE:	19,29	J71-J72	
	11	J83-J84	(1990 only)
	12	J85-J86	(1990 only)
NO SENATE RACE:	17,18,27,28	J75-J76	(SENATOR 1)
	17,18,27,28	J77-J78	(SENATOR 2)

J. LEADERSHIP POSITION HELD BY HOUSE INCUMBENT (AND PREVIOUS OFFICE OF CANDIDATES: 1990) (Not Asked in 1992)

INCUMBENT RUNNING:	33,34	J79-J80	
	35,36	J87-J88	(1990 only)
OPEN RACE:	31	J89-J90	(1990 only)
	32	J91-J92	(1990 only)

>> II.C. RECORDED VARIABLES (DERIVED MEASURES)

Recoded Measures

We have added five sets of reorganized measures (VST0642-VST0871) and a number of other analytic variables (VST0872-VST0892) described below. There are no new data in Variables VST0642-ST0871; they are merely reorganized versions of the original survey variables. The five series are:

1. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, organized by Party of Candidate. (VPS0642-VPS0687)
2. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, organized by incumbency/challenger status of candidate (VPS0688-VPS0733)

3. SENATE, organized by party of candidate (excludes Senators not running) (VPS0734-VPS0779)
4. SENATE, organized by incumbency/challenger status of candidate (excludes Senators not running) (VPS0780-VPS0825)
5. SENATE variables, organized by seat within state (excluding non-incumbent Senate candidates (1988), but including all other Senators.) (VPS0826-VPS0871.)

The Concept of Senate Classes

U.S. Senators belong to one of three possible Senate Classes, numbered as Class 1, Class 2 and Class 3. Each election includes Senators from only one class (except for special elections). For instance, Class 1 Senators faced election in 1988 (and will face election again six years later, in 1994). Class 2 Senators faced election in 1990 (and will face election again six years later, in 1996). Finally, Class 3 Senators faced election in 1992 (and will face election again six years later, in 1998).

Since each state has two Senators, the states can be grouped by their combination of Senate classes. That is, approximately one third of the 50 states have one Class 1 Senator and one Class 2 Senator; another third of the states have one Class 1 Senator and one Class 3 Senator; and the final third of the states have one Class 2 Senator and one Class 3 Senator. The states are grouped as follows:

TABLE 3

Classes 1 and 2	Classes 1 and 3	Classes 2 and 3
Maine	Connecticut	New Hampshire
Massachusetts	Vermont	Illinois
Rhode Island	New York	Iowa
Delaware	Pennsylvania	Kansas
New Jersey	Indiana	South Dakota
Michigan	Ohio	Alabama
Minnesota	Wisconsin	Arkansas
Nebraska	Missouri	Georgia
Virginia	North Dakota	Louisiana
Mississippi	Florida	North Carolina
Texas	Maryland	South Carolina
Tennessee	Arizona	Kentucky
West Virginia	Nevada	Oklahoma
Montana	Utah	Colorado
New Mexico	California	Idaho
Wyoming	Washington	Oregon
	Hawaii	Alaska

>> II.D. THE CONCEPT OF SENATE SEATS

The Concept of Senate Seats

Each of the 50 states has, of course, two Senate seats, which, for the purpose of these studies we have arbitrarily defined as Seat #1 and Seat #2. For each state, each Seat must be occupied by a Senator from one and only one of the three Senate Classes. For the first group of states listed above, Seat #1 is occupied by a Senator from Class 1, while Seat #2 is occupied by a Senator from Class 2. For the second set of states listed above, Seat #1 is occupied by a Senator from Class 1 while Seat #2 is occupied by a Senator from Class 3. Finally, for the third group of States listed above, Seat #1 is occupied by a Senator from Class 2 while Seat #2

is occupied by a Senator from Class 3. This mapping of Senate Classes into Seat #'s is consistent across all three study years. See the listing in the blue section (Master Codes--Contextual Variables) at the back of this codebook, for names of occupants of Seat #1 and Seat #2 for each state and year.

The Interaction of Candidate Numbers and Seat Numbers

As laid out in Table 1 above, Senators and candidates are assigned Candidate Numbers in each NES survey, which reflect that person's party and his or her status vis-…-vis the most proximate election. These Candidate Numbers then determine where in the survey certain questions are asked about that person. That is, for instance, a Democratic Senate Incumbent who is up for election (and running) in that study year is always assigned Candidate Number 13. The likes/dislikes section regarding that type of Candidate is always asked in questions D1-D4. In the following study year, that same Senator might be a sitting incumbent while the other Senator from his/her state is facing election, in which case the Senator in question would be assigned Candidate Number 19 - a Democratic Incumbent with Term Not Up. The likes/dislikes section for a Senator with that Candidate Number is always asked in questions D9-D12. The utility of the Senate Seat assignment, as described above, is that this same Senator (who was a Candidate #13 in one study and a Candidate #19 in another) always occupies Senate Seat #1, regardless of his or her Candidate Number.

A perfect example of this situation is Democratic Senator George Mitchell of Maine, who is a Class 1 Senator. Senator Mitchell faced re-election in 1988 and was therefore assigned a Candidate Number 13. In 1990 Senator Mitchell was a Senator Not Up in a state with a race, so he was assigned Candidate Number 19. In 1992, when there was no race in Maine, Senator Mitchell was assigned Candidate Number 17. For all three study years, however, Senator Mitchell is the occupant of Senate Seat #1 in Maine. Therefore, regardless of the study year, all questions for Maine respondents referring to Senate Seat #1 in the Recoded Measures section (VPS0826-PS0877) and in the Contextual Data section (VPS0915-VPS1150) refer to Senator Mitchell.

In some states, when a Senate Incumbent either retired or lost re-election, the occupant of that Senate Seat changes across the study years. For instance, in Connecticut, Sen. Lowell Weicker held Seat #1 in the 1988 study, but was replaced by Sen. Joseph Lieberman for the 1990 and 1992 studies. Both Senator Weicker and Senator Lieberman were Class 1 Senators. Therefore, questions from 1988 Connecticut respondents referring to Seat #1 are referring to Sen. Weicker, while similar questions from the 1990 and 1992 studies are referring to Sen. Lieberman.

Within each of the five Recoded Measures series, the variables are organized by content, and within each content area by party (or incumbency status, or by Senate seat). For example, variables 642-687 are House survey variables, by party. V646-653 are variables reporting contact with the Democratic candidate (regardless of incumbency status) and variables 654-661 are the same variables for the Republican candidate. Variables 664-669 are the respondent's Likes of the Democrat, v670-675 are the Likes for the Republican, and so on.

In v873-v892 we have also added a number of variables intended to make analyses more convenient. One set of these variables (VST0873-ST0877) denotes the Senate class number (1,2, or 3) and the NES candidate number (see Table 1, above) for those occupants of a state's Senate Seat #1 and Senate Seat #2. Another set of these variables (VST0884 and ST0891) denote who won for each House and Senate race. Third, for each race, variables (VST0882,ST0883 and VST0889,ST0890) categorize the respondent as having voted for a) the incumbent or not and b) the race winner or not. Fourth, four variables (VST0878-ST0881 and VST0885-ST0888) are coded, for both

the House and the Senate, which combine the respondent's partisanship and vote choice, and ability to recall the candidates. These variables are based on work reported by Robert Eubank and David Gow. Most of the House-related variables for 1992 are filled with missing data. Last, there is a variable (VST0892) that records the number of days since the election when this interview was taken.

>> II.E. CONTEXTUAL DATA

Contextual Data

In addition to the data drawn from the interview, this dataset includes a large number of contextual variables describing all fifty states, the characteristics of the all incumbent Senators from the fifty states and of (most) challengers in states where there were races, and the campaigns and outcomes of the Senate races in each year. The content of the contextual data variables for the 1988 study was designed by a committee consisting of Professor Richard Fenno, University of Rochester; Professor Raymond Wolfinger, University of California at Berkeley; Dr. Thomas Mann, The Brookings Institution; and Professor Gary Jacobson, the University of California at San Diego. The 1988 contextual data were coded (and made machine-readable) by Jon Krasno at the Brookings Institution and the University of California, Berkeley. The National Election Studies staff was responsible for the creation of a dictionary for these variables, their reformatting as necessary, and their merging into the original 1988 Senate dataset. The 1990 and 1992 contextual data variables were assembled by the NES staff, primarily by duplicating from the 1988 contextual data variables, where appropriate.

Specifically, the contextual variables include: election returns for the Senate primary as well as the Senate general election; background demographic information for (Senate) incumbents; roll call voting indices (e.g., ADA ratings) for Senators for the years 1983-1992; information about the Senate campaign, including election outcome predictions; campaign manager and pollster used; campaign content and spending variables; and some demographic, geographic and economic data for the state.

For 1990 and 1992, some variables have been padded with missing data (1989 mass mailings and 1990 AFL-CIO ratings, Roll Call projection of the race, campaign manager, etc.) because they could not be found or were not available at the time of data release.

The contextual data contains two sections (Seat #1 Senator and Seat #2 Senator) the design of which matches that of the Seat #1/Seat #2 layout described above in the recoded measures section. That is, for instance, in
Alabama, Senator Howell Heflin holds Seat #1, and has held that seat throughout all three waves of the Senate study. Therefore, all questions relating to Seat #1 Senator for Alabama respondents will refer to Sen. Heflin, regardless of the study year. In Connecticut, Sen. Lowell Weicker held Seat #1 in the 1988 study, but was replaced by Sen. Joseph Lieberman for the 1990 and 1992 studies. Therefore, questions from 1988 Connecticut respondents referring to Seat #1 are referring to Sen. Weicker, while similar questions from the 1990 and 1992 studies are referring to Sen. Lieberman.

Use the unique name list (found in the blue section, Master Codes--Contextual Variables) and v915 (for Seat #1 Senator name) or v1151 (for Seat #2 Senator name) to list the occupants of Seat #1 or Seat #2 for each state and study year. The occupants of Seat #1 and Seat #2 for each state and each year are also listed in this first part of the blue section (Master Codes--Contextual Variables) for greater convenience.

Notice that the occupants of Seat #1 and/or Seat #2 could have had their survey questions asked in many different sections. That is, in 1988, Alabama Senator

Howell Heflin (who holds Seat #1 in Alabama), had a candidate number of 27. Therefore, his likes/dislikes questions would have been asked in section D17-D20. In 1990, Senator Heflin had a candidate number of 13, so his likes/dislikes questions would have been asked in section D1-D4. Finally, in 1992 Senator Heflin had a candidate number of 19, so that his likes/dislikes questions would have been asked in section D9-D12. However, for Alabama cases, regardless of the study year, any question referring to Seat #1 Senator in either the Recoded section (VST0826-VST0877) or in the Contextual section (VST0915-VST1150) is referring to Howell Heflin.

>> III. SAMPLING INFORMATION
>> III.A. THE SAMPLE DESIGN

The Sample Design

The objectives of the study dictated that roughly equal sampling variances be obtained for each state. Hence, the sample was stratified by state. In 1988, the target number of interviews for each state was 75, based on a two-stage household selection algorithm. In 1990, the target number of interviews in states with Senate elections was 75; in the 15 states without Senate election, the target number of interviews was 48. In 1992, the target number was 56 interviews per state, whether or not there was a Senate race in the state.

Three different algorithms for selecting household telephone numbers were used. The 1988 Senate study utilized a typical Waksberg-Mitofsky design. At the first stage, working blocks of household numbers were sampled with probability proportional to size (PPS). For each state 25 such primary sampling units were chosen. Each PSU was a block of working numbers within a one hundred range, or hundred number block (HNB). Within each HNB, telephone numbers were chosen by a restricted simple random sampling procedure.

The result then was an equal two-stage probability for working telephone numbers. Finally, selection of voters within households was accomplished using a series of Kish selection tables. The numbers of eligible respondents per sample household were noted. The elements of the sample are self-weighting for each state. Users should note however that since the target number of interviews for each state is equal, while the populations are of unequal size, the probability of selection for any individual varies by state, and therefore, when it is desired to make inferences about descriptive statistics, comparing states, the sample is not self-weighting, and the weight given in variable 2 should be used.

Because the target number of interviews per state was 75, and a roughly 57% cooperation or response rate was estimated, approximately six sample elements were initially drawn per HNB, with an expected completion rate of about three. This set the study-wide target sample size at N=3750.

The 1990 Senate Election Study used a dual-frame design telephone sample with approximately half of the sample selected from a frame of listed numbers and half generated using an RDD procedure. The new RDD design used for the first time by NES in the 1990 Senate Election Study involves the generation of random telephone numbers from the set of hundred series in the list sample. Each hundred series from the list sample is known to have at least one listed phone number--the number selected for the list sample. From ongoing methodological research, the Survey

Research Center has a data set containing the count of listed numbers for each possible hundred series.

Within each of the fifty states, an equal probability sample of random numbers was generated using a version of the "PPS-to-listed counts" two-stage RDD design that James Lepkowski of the Survey Research Center has been researching. The design is described in detail in appendix B. The weight variable (VST0002) should be used for all descriptive analyses comparing two or more states (or one state at two points in time). This variable compensates for unequal probabilities of selection between states and for unequal probabilities introduced by the dual-frame design.

The 1992 Senate Election Study used a "list assisted" or "listed hundred series" RDD sample design that selects telephone numbers using the GENESYS RDD sampling system, through Marketing Systems Group. This "list assisted" RDD design uses a one-stage selection of telephone numbers with no clustering. Samples of RDD telephone numbers are selected from a frame consisting of all the possible numbers that can be generated from a hundred series (the first eight digits of a phone number) that have at least two listed household phone numbers. Once a household telephone number was selected and called, if there was more than one eligible person living in the household a random respondent was chosen using a respondent selection table developed by Kish. Because only one person in a household was selected to respond from all eligible household members, persons in smaller households had a greater chance of selection than persons in larger households. Therefore, for person level analyses, the household weight should be multiplied by the number of eligible persons in the household to create a final weight for pooled analysis of states data. See Appendix A for more information.

>> III.B. DETERMINING CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF THE RESPONDENT
Determining Congressional District of Respondent

Since 1978, NES strategy has been to provide for respondents the names of the candidates for election to the House of Representatives in the districts where the respondent is interviewed, rather than simply asking the respondent to evaluate "your congressman." The belief is that the concrete stimulus of the candidate name will assist the respondent to remember details about the candidate that will allow him/her to provide evaluations of the candidate.

In the traditional NES post-election studies, the sample frame is geographically based, and congressional district can be identified with virtual certainty in advance of the interview. Thus, questionnaires can be pre-edited by interviewers and tailored to specific congressional districts. The analogous task is required in a telephone sample, except it is much more difficult to carry out.

The correspondence of telephone number to any other geographic boundary is far from being one-to-one. Particularly in metropolitan areas, characterized by large numbers of telephone exchanges and multiple congressional districts, the determination of the specific congressional district into which a telephone is being dialed is a complicated one. For the 1988 Senate study, MOR, working with NES, designed a two-step procedure used to predetermine congressional district assignments for each telephone number used in the sample.

The MOR Hundred Number Block sampling database shows the residential listed fill per HNB separately for each zip code into which the HNB dials. The records give a proportionate split, allowing a probability assignment for a given telephone number into each possible zip code. Through NES, MOR was able to secure the one-time use of a proprietary data set of the Tyson Capitol Institute of Bethesda, MD. The Tyson data set is a cross-reference of zip codes and congressional district (CD) boundaries .

The allocation of zip code geography across CD boundaries is documented in the Tyson data using an indicator of "preponderant" fit. Specifically, where a zip is entirely included within one CD, a record reflects this subset relationship. Furthermore, where a zip is subsumed under two CDs, a "one" is assigned to the CD that holds the preponderant area of the zip and a "two" is assigned to the remaining CD. Likewise for a three-way split, numbers are used to represent the ordinal of the importance of the CD to the zip. These ordinal indicators were transformed to expected probabilities, using the assumption that the processes determining CD boundaries are blind to zip code boundaries.

Essentially, the telephone number was assigned into a CD based on the joint probabilities of telephone numbers occurring in a zip code, and the proportionate distribution of zip codes in given CDs.

This led to a fairly clear decision rule for most cases. Because of the relative scale of CDs compared to zip codes and HNBs, most cases were only trivially ambiguous. Specifically, assigning the CD with the maximum probability to each telephone number led to a mean joint assignment probability of .95.

MOR sampling staff took a sample of the lower-probability assignment telephone numbers and looked them up in address-listing telephone directories. For those that were listed telephone numbers, a CD was evaluated based on a map showing CD boundaries. This exercise was abandoned when misclassifications were identified only rarely. A procedure was then adopted to allow a scheduled call back in the event that a respondent claimed that they were in a different CD from the pre-assigned one.

In 1990, the 'list' half of the sample purchased from Survey Sampling Inc. identified the congressional district of each telephone number. The Survey Section of the Institute for Social Research randomly generated RDD numbers from the 100-series clusters of the Survey Sampling listed numbers, and imputed the congressional district from that listed number. A procedure was adopted to allow a scheduled call back in the event that a respondent claimed that they were in a different CD from the pre-assigned one.

For 1992 cases - PLEASE USE EXTREME CAUTION WHEN REFERENCING CD INFORMATION. NES is unable to verify the accuracy of CD assignment, which was done after the field period and very late in the data processing stages. NES was unable to pre-identify the CD for each of the phone numbers in the sample, and therefore changed the study design to some degree, by not asking certain House-related questions (likes/dislikes, for example) and by asking others as open-end (vote, name recall) and later coding with the candidate number, regardless of whether the respondent was in the correct CD for that candidate name.

The 1992 CD assignments were made in the following way: NES passed the respondent's phone number and zip code to Marketing Systems Group (who had originally drawn the sample), who passed the information against the Donnelley Database and through another sub-contractor's database to identify the census tract, and from there the CD. In cases where the associated census tract on the Donnelley Database was deemed invalid, the listings on the Donnelley Database were flagged that had the same Area Code, Exchange and Zip Code as the respondent's record. The flagged listings were then combined together based on the census tract. Frequencies by census tract were calculated and the CD was obtained based on those frequencies. Essentially, then, CD was assigned based on the joint probability of a telephone number being in a certain census tract and of the census tract being in a certain CD.

>> III.C. STUDY PARAMETERS: RESPONSE RATE, NUMBER OF CASES, TIME IN FIELD

Study Parameters: Response Rate, Number of

The study response rates were 43% for 1988, 46% for 1990 and 56% for 1992. By comparison, the 1984 Continuous Monitoring Study, a study of politics of about the same length conducted for NES by the Survey Research Center's telephone facility, had a response rate of 62%.

TABLE 4a: Cumulative 1988 Interview production by Week in %

	WK# 1 Nov.14-Nov.20	WK# 2 Nov.21-Nov.27	WK# 3 Nov.28-Dec.4	WK# 4 Dec.5-Dec.11	WK# 5 Dec.12-Dec.20	N
OVERALL	6.8	18.6	46.1	78.7	100%	3145
Version #1	8.1	23.4	54.8	83.1	100%	124
Version #2	--	--	27.6	70.5	100%	105
Version #3	--	--	18.2	66.7	100%	33
Version #4	--	--	46.7	83.8	100%	197
Version #5	9.6	24.7	51.9	80.9	100%	1392
Version #6	7.5	22.2	56.0	83.9	100%	953
Version #7	--	--	--	56.9	100%	72
Version #8	--	--	--	51.3	100%	152
Version #9	--	--	--	56.4	100%	117

Table 4b: 1990 Cumulative Interview production by Week in %

	Wk# 1 Nov. 7-Nov. 13	Wk# 2 Nov. 14-Nov. 20	Wk# 3 Nov. 21-Nov. 27	Wk# 4 Nov. 28-Dec. 3	Wk# 5 Dec. 4-Dec. 10	Wk# 6 Dec. 11 Dec.17	Wk#7 Dec18 Dec.22	N
Total	13.3	32.5	51.5	72.3	85.8	97.7	100%	3349
V#1	16.7	38.6	42.8	48.0	78.2	99.0	100%	96
V#2	15.9	31.5	48.7	65.6	83.8	98.1	100%	308
V#3	5.3	5.3	5.3	100.0	100.0	100.0	100%	38
V#4	29.2	41.7	48.6	75.0	91.0	99.7	100%	144
V#5	9.5	32.6	55.0	74.7	86.5	98.2	100%	1565
V#6	17.7	31.3	51.4	67.6	82.4	96.6	100%	667
V#8 *	14.8	37.2	56.4	74.0	87.5	97.1	100%	459

V#9	19.4	19.4	19.4	86.1	100.0	100.0	100%	72

* NO CASES IN VERSION 7

Table 4c: 1992 Cumulative Interview production by Week in %

	Wk# 1 Nov. 4- Nov. 10	Wk# 2 Nov. 11- Nov. 17	Wk# 3 Nov. 18- Nov. 24	Wk# 4 Nov. 25- Dec. 1	Wk# 5 Dec. 2- Dec. 8.	N
OVERALL	31.6	59.9	78.3	89.9	100.0	2759

>> IV. SPECIAL DATA NOTES

Special Data Notes

1. The 1992 California interviews have been duplicated in this dataset, to cover the unique situation of California's two Senate races in 1992. For 1992 California cases with case I.D. in the range of 20,000 - 29,999, the Senate race referred to was the Boxer-Herschensohn race. The 1992 California cases with I.D.'s in the range of 30,000 - 39,999 are the same respondents as above, but are referring instead to the Feinstein-Seymour Senate race.

2. In Louisiana's second congressional district (VST0006=4502) two Democrats ran for the House seat in 1990. Both the Democrat and the Republican House Candidate Variables (VST0018 and VST0019) are coded as 31 (Democrat in open race). The House race type (VST0024) is coded 57 (Democrat retiring with Democrat and Other running). Question wording (where applicable) referred to both candidates as Democrats.

3. In Vermont's House race (1990), we substituted Bernard Sanders (an Independent) for the Democratic candidate since he was the higher profile challenger to the Republican incumbent. The Democrat House Candidate variable (VST0018) is coded 30. The House race type (VST0024) is coded 29 (Republican incumbent facing Democratic and Other challenger). Question wording (where applicable) referred to Sanders as an Independent.

4. In Hawaii's second congressional district (1990), we treated the House race as an open race (VST0024=55) since the seat had only been filled since late September, 1990.

5. In Minnesota's 1990 Gubernatorial race, the Republican challenger Jon Grunseth dropped out on October 28 and was replaced by Arne Carlson as the Republican. All relevant questions referred to Arne Carlson as the Republican.

6. Both the 1990 Connecticut and 1990 Alaska Gubernatorial races were contested by three high profile candidates. Lowell Weicker ran as an independent in Connecticut while Walter Hickel ran as an independent in Alaska. The vote questions specifically referred to both of these independent candidates as well as the major party candidates. The Gubernatorial Race Type variable (VST0026) is coded 59 (Democrat retiring, Democrat, Republican and other candidates running) for both states.

7. In 1990, four states had uncontested Senate races, two with Democratic incumbents running unopposed (Arkansas and Georgia) and two with Republican incumbents running unopposed (Mississippi and Virginia)

8. Unhappily, Senator Jacob Hecht of Nevada was erroneously referred to throughout the 1988 interview as a Democrat instead of a Republican. The subsequent data problems are obvious enough in places where the party was read to the respondent along with the Senator's name, in, for example, the likes and dislikes questions, and the Senate vote choice question, but the error may well have contaminated responses to all subsequent questions about Hecht, even where the party is not specifically mentioned, as in the contact batteries. (Of course, the problem also affects his opponent, Richard Bryan, who was mislabeled as a Republican.)

   The problem with the vote choice variable should be specifically mentioned, since the responses to it are particularly confusing. When asked for whom he/she voted, a respondent could answer either "the Democrat" or Senator Hecht. In either case, the respondent would have been coded as voting for Senator Hecht, when in the first instance, the respondent may have been trying to convey a vote for his opponent. Or, the respondent may have known that he voted for a Democrat, and responded with "Hecht" when presented with the cue that Hecht was a Democrat. In short, we would recommend strongly against the use of the Senate vote choice variable for Nevada.

   Questions asked prior to the misidentification (i.e., recall, recognition and thermometer) have been corrected for this release so that, for example, v86 now holds data referring to Bryan. These corrections have been made in both the original survey variables and the recoded variables.

   Also, all variables in the original survey and recode sections of the dataset relating to Senator Hecht and his opponent which were asked after the misidentification by party (i.e., starting with the Likes/Dislikes series) have been set to missing data.

>> V. HOW TO ORDER (AND TAPE FORM)

>> VI. USER DOCUMENTATION

CODEBOOK INFORMATION

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

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

```
Line

1  ==============================
2  VAR 480026    NAME-R NOT VT-WAS R REG TO VT
3                COLUMNS 61   - 61
4                NUMERIC
5                MD=0 OR GE 8
6
7                  Q. 17.  (IF R DID NOT VOTE)  WERE YOU REGISTERED (ELIGIBLE)
8                  TO VOTE.
9                  ..........................................................
10
11            82       1.  YES
12           149       2.  NO
13
14             0       8.  DK
15             9       9.  NA
16           422       0.  INAP., R VOTED
```

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

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

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

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

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

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

non-survey items also have unique item numbers (for example "CSheet.1").

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

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

Lines 11-16
Code values are listed with descriptive labels. Valid codes (those not having 'missing' status in line 5) are presented first, followed by the values described in line 5. For continuous variables, one line may appear providing the range of possible values. A blank line usually separates the 'valid' and 'missing' values.

Lines 11-16
Marginals are usually provided for discrete variables. The counts may be un-weighted or weighted; check the Study codebook introductory text to determine weight usage.