The 1992 National Election Study entailed both a pre-election interview and a post-election re-interview. Approximately half of the 1992 cases are comprised of empaneled respondents who were first interviewed in the 1990 National Election Study and later in the 1991 Political Consequences of War Study. The other half of the cases are a freshly drawn cross-section sample. (Details of the sample design are given in "Sample Design of the 1992 Pre- and Post-Election Study", below.)

The panel component of the study design provides an opportunity to trace how the changing fortunes of the Bush presidency, from the high levels of approval at the start of the Gulf War, through the decline after the onset of a recession, affected voting in the November 1992 presidential election. It also permits analysts to investigate the origins of the Clinton and Perot coalitions as well as changes in the public's political preferences over the two years preceding the 1992 election.

Altogether, 2485 citizens were interviewed in the 9 weeks prior to the November 3, 1992 election. [Note: The original study Staff release of the 1992 National Election Study in April, 1993 contained 2,487 cases. See the note on "A Note on Deletion of Cases", below, for further information about the two cases deleted from this edition of the collection.] To permit analysis of the impact of the unfolding election campaign, a random half of the sample was released to the field on September 1 and the other half on October 1st. 1359 of the pre-election interviews were conducted with panel respondents; 1126 with cross-section respondents. In the weeks following the election, 2255 pre-election respondents were reinterviewed; 1250 panel, 1005 cross-section. Further details of the administration of the surveys are given in "Study Administration", below.

The two components of the study -- the panel and the new cross-section -- were designed to be easily used together to create a combined nationally representative sample of the American electorate. Several case weights are provided with this data set.

V3008 (which incorporates sampling, nonresponse and post-stratification adjustments) should be used when analyzing the combined sample (the panel and the new cross-section respondents).

V3009 (which incorporates sampling, nonresponse and post-stratification adjustments) should be used when analyzing the panel respondents alone.

V7000 (which corrects for panel attrition and the aging of the panel respondents, but does not incorporate sampling, nonresponse and post-stratification adjustments) should be used when comparing either the panel respondents or the combined panel and new cross-section respondents to previous (unweighted) National Election Studies data collections.

See "Sample Design of the 1992 Pre- and Post-Election Study", below, and the
STUDY CONTENT; SUBSTANTIVE THEMES

The content for the 1992 Election Study reflects its double duty, both as the traditional presidential election year time-series data collection and as a panel study. The substantive themes represented in the 1992 questionnaires include:

* interest in the political campaigns; concern about the outcome; and attentiveness to the media's coverage of the campaign

* information about politics

* evaluation of the presidential candidates and placement of presidential candidates on various issue dimensions

* partisanship and evaluations of the political parties

* knowledge of, contact with, and evaluation of House candidates (including questions on how their Representative voted on the Persian Gulf War resolution and whether he/she was implicated in the House banking scandal); opinions on term limitations

* political participation: turnout in the Presidential primaries and in the November general election; other forms of electoral campaign activity

* vote choice for President, the U.S. House, and the U.S. Senate, including second choice for President

* personal and national economic well-being, with particular attention to the impact of the recession

* positions on social welfare issues including: social security; government health insurance; federal budget priorities, and the role of the government in the provision of jobs and good standard of living

* positions on social issues including: abortion, the death penalty; prayer in the schools; the rights of homosexuals; sexual harassment and women's rights

* racial and ethnic stereotypes; opinions on school integration and affirmative action; attitudes towards immigrants (particularly Hispanics and Asians); opinions on immigration policy and bilingual education

* opinions about the nation's most important problem and the most important issues discussed during the local congressional campaign

* political predispositions: moral traditionalism; patriotism; political efficacy; egalitarianism; individualism; trust in government; racial prejudice;
and feminist consciousness

* social altruism and social connectedness
* assessments of U.S. involvement in the Persian Gulf War and of U.S. foreign policy goals
* feeling thermometers on a wide range of political figures and political groups; affinity with various social groups
* detailed demographic information and measures of religious affiliation and religiosity

Congressional Ballot Cards, Candidate Lists, and Candidate Numbers

In the usual NES Post-Election survey, and for 1992, in the Pre-Election survey as well, respondents are asked several questions about their particular Congresspersons and Senators. Interviewers pre-edited questionnaires to fill in the names appropriate for the state and congressional district in which the respondent was living (or was living during the pre-election interview). Each candidate and Senator is assigned a unique number that reflects his or her incumbency status and party. (See Candidate Number Codes and Lists). Particular questions in the survey require the insertion by the interviewer during pre-editing of the names of candidates. See, for example, post-election question B1, which includes feeling thermometers for the various candidates. The Candidate Lists used by the interviewers, which show which candidates are associated with which congressional district and with which numbers they are tagged, can be found in Appendix F.

Asking questions about incumbent candidates is somewhat more problematic in a year when redistricting occurred, and for the Pre-Election survey there is the additional complication that a number of states held their Congressional primaries after the Pre-Election field work had started. Further details can be found at the documentation for Pre-Election questions J10-J11.

Handling of Congressional Incumbency Where Redistricting has Occurred

Throughout, whenever the word "incumbent" is used, its referent is a representative who was a member of the 102nd Congress; i.e., the Congress in session prior to the November 1992 General Election. Due to redistricting as a result of the 1990 U.S. Census, any given incumbent's district for the 103rd Congress may consist of a fairly different geographical area from the area covered by the district prior to the boundary changes. Therefore, prior to 1992, the "incumbent" may or may not have been the representative for the particular piece of geography (the sample segment or census tract) in which the respondent lives. For each sample segment, we have included in the dataset its 1992 congressional district number, v3019, and its congressional district number in 1990, v3020. By comparing the two, it can be determined whether the "incumbent" in question was actually the respondent's incumbent prior to the 1992 general election.

"Lagged" Measures Obtained from 1990 and 1991 Interviews
Slightly more than half of the respondents in the 1992 study were also interviewed in 1990 and 1991. Therefore, all of the variables associated with the 1990 Post-Election Study (ICPSR 9548) and the 1991 Political Consequences of War Study (ICPSR 9673) are available for use as "lagged" measures in the current release of this collection.

STUDY ADMINISTRATION

Pre-election Study Release of Sample

To permit analysis of the impact of the unfolding election campaign and to minimize the relationship between interviews taken late in the campaign period and the difficulty of obtaining an interview, NES divided the Pre-Election study sample into two random parts. Administration of the first random half occurred between September 1 and September 30; the second half between October 1 and October 31st, with the first two days of November as "cleanup." The two part division applied to both panel and cross-section samples.

Note that the study period began before Labor Day, the traditional start of the Election Studies (and Presidential campaigns). The combination of a late date for Labor Day (Sept. 7) and an early date for Election Day (Nov. 3rd) would have shortened our standard field period by about a week, which would have reduced the overall response rate.

Sample "Replicates"

To more closely tailor the field effort to the actual sample performance during this study, both parts of the sample (panel and cross-section) were randomly subdivided into five replicates, each of which is a proper, random subsample of the NES sample. Replicates 1 and 2 were considered the "base sample," certain to be released, with three replicates being held in reserve to be released for fieldwork October 1, 1992, if it was decided they were needed. Replicates 4 and 5 were released at that time.

Survey Modes: Design and Implementation

One of the administrative problems in fielding a panel study is that respondents have had an intervening period of time in which to relocate, perhaps at some remove from areas where field staff is maintained. Additionally, some of the SRC sample primary areas were replaced between 1990 and 1992, and therefore potentially some of the 1990 Election Study respondents lived in areas where SRC interviewers were no longer on staff. We estimated that between 50 and 125 respondents might have moved to areas in which SRC did not have interviewers, or might be living in their 1990 residence, in a place where SRC no longer maintained interviewing capability. (As it turned out, the total number of panel respondents that we interviewed who were "out of range" for either of these two reasons was 43.) It was our intention to interview as many panel respondents as possible, but we did not want to incur the additional costs associated with interviewer travel. Therefore, we prepared a truncated version of both Pre- and Post-Election Survey questionnaires, (the "Short-Form") to be administered over the telephone to those panel respondents who had moved out of range.

Interviews, both in the Pre- and in the Post Election surveys, were also administered over the telephone to many respondents, both panel and
The cross-section, who did not meet the "panel out-of-range" criteria for telephone interviewing. The mis-implementation of the design also entailed the inappropriate use of the full-length questionnaire. Table 7, below, sums up the situation. In total, 86 percent of the interviews (91 percent before the election and 81 percent of those conducted after the election) were administered as mandated by the study design: face-to-face with the full length questionnaires or by phone for those panel respondents who moved out of range.

A NOTE ON DELETION OF CASES

In putting together the panel file, study staff examined with particular attention the work of one interviewer and decided that his entire production for 1990 was suspect. Two panel reinterviews in 1992 were thus based on 1990 interviews which were very likely faked in whole or very large part. The decision was made to eliminate these interviews from the 1992 dataset (and also from the panel file). Consequently, the total N for the ICPSR release of these data is 2485 as compared with a N of 2487 in the Study Staff release of the 1992 Cross-Section data. The tables found in this introduction were produced using the original Study Staff release of the data and reflect the original N of 2487.

Table 7: Mode and Form Administration in the 1992 Pre-/Post Election Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel Respondents</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Pre-Election</th>
<th>Post-Election</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face (A)</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone (B)</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td></td>
<td>149</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1361</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross Section Respondents</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Pre-Election</th>
<th>Post-Election</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face (C)</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
<td>1053</td>
<td>93.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone (D)</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1126</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Pre-Election</th>
<th>Post-Election</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
<td>2208</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td></td>
<td>154</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2487</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. The 1155 Pre-election respondents in this category include 16 Panel interviews taken F-T-F using the Spanish version of the questionnaire.

B. The Pre-election respondents in this category include 1 Spanish language panel interview, taken by phone.

C. The pre-election total includes 4 Spanish version questionnaires taken F-T-F.
D. The 5 cases in the Pre-election category consist of 1 F-T-F and 3 Phone short-form, plus 1 Spanish language cross-section case.

SURVEY FORMS: DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION

There were two [5] forms of both the Pre- and the Post- Election Study questionnaire: a short form, to be administered over the phone to panel respondents who were "out of range," as described above, and a standard, or full-length questionnaire to be administered to everyone else. The questions on the short-form were a subset of those on the full length questionnaires whose 70 minutes in length was thought to be unacceptably long for a telephone interview.

50 minutes worth of content was selected for the short form, both Pre- and Post-Election Surveys. The criteria for inclusion were that the questions were "core," i.e., questions part of the NES time-series, as opposed to recently piloted or topical items, or that they related to the focus of the 1991 Political Consequences of War Study. We decided not to repeat most of the demographics items for the approximately 100 panel respondents we expected would be interviewed with the short form, relying instead on their responses in the 1990 survey. Additionally, some congressional content was deleted, because of the difficulty in assigning respondents over the phone to the newly drawn congressional districts.

Because we estimated the number of cases affected to be few and randomly scattered across the country, we did not design the instrument for the telephone. Except for the income question, we made no adjustments to the questionnaire for the difference in mode. In general, interviewers were expected to read response options to the respondent and to repeat them as necessary until they were clear to the respondent.

All interviews with a short form questionnaire, except for Spanish language, and including "legitimate" or "out-of-range" panel respondent interviews, have been designated as partial interviews, in the result code variables for the Pre- and Post-Election Studies (v3033 and v5012).

EVALUATION OF PROBLEMS IN STUDY IMPLEMENTATION

The problems mentioned above did not become fully evident until coding was virtually completed, in the last week of February. At its March 1 meeting, the NES Board of Overseers, to whom these problems were reported, instructed the Principal Investigators to assess the significance of these problems with respect to data quality. This work was carried out by the Principal Investigators and members of the Study Staff in consultation with Board members, SRC methodologists and Center for Political Studies personnel as appropriate. The findings are available in NES Technical Report No. 43, available from NES Project Staff.

As the Technical Report documents in detail, the inappropriate use of the telephone and the short-form questionnaire thankfully had only a negligible impact on the quality of the 1992 data. When the short-form questionnaire was used, it of course generated missing data on those items that appeared on the full-length questionnaire but not on the short-form. But this resulted in a very slight increase (less than .05 percentage points) in the standard errors of the affected variables. The pattern of missing data (from use of the
short-form questionnaire) is unrelated to the demographic or political characteristics of respondents. Instead, interviewers turned to the short form when it appeared they would have difficulty securing an interview for other reasons having to do with the field administration of the study. The same holds for use of phone instead of face-to-face interviewing. Respondents interviewed over the phone are politically indistinguishable from those interviewed face-to-face. Attributes of the study administration, not attributes of the individual respondents, are associated with the propensity of interviewers to conduct some of their interviews over the phone. Finally, although some survey questions perform differently across the two modes of interviewing, the distribution of responses and the relationship among variables are substantively the same among phone and face-to-face respondents.

RESPONSE RATES

The Pre-Election study response rate for the cross section sample was 74.0%. Recalculating the response rate to eliminate 4 short-form, cross-section interviews (partials) results in a response rate of 73.7%[6]. For the panel sample, the response (or reinterview) rate is 77.7% when partials, or short form interviews, are included, but drops to 69.2% when they are excluded. Post-Election reinterview rates are 91.8% for the panel, including partials, and 85.0% excluding the partial or short-form interviews. The cross-section Post-Election reinterview rate was 89.3% including 4 partials; 88.9% excluding them. These calculations do not differentiate between face-to-face and telephone modes of interviewing.

INTERVIEW COMPLETION RATE

Table 8 lays out the number of interviews taken for each week elapsing after the Nov. 3 General Election. In 1992, 25.8% of the interviews were completed in the first two weeks after the election; 53.1% in the first four weeks. For comparison, in 1988, 55% of the interviews were taken in the first two weeks after the election, and 82% in the first four weeks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATES</th>
<th>NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENT OF INTERVIEWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 4-Nov.10</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov.11-Nov.17</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov.18-Nov.24</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov.25-Dec. 1</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>1198</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 2- Dec. 8</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>1546</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 9-Dec.15</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec.16-Dec.22</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>88.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec.23-Dec.29</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2085</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec.30-Jan. 5</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>2210</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 6-Jan.13</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2255</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VARIABLES SUPPRESSED FOR REASONS OF CONFIDENTIALITY

Starting with the 1986 Election Study, NES has released occupation code variables in somewhat less detail than in years past. This dataset includes a
two-digit code with 71 categories corresponding to Census Bureau occupational groupings. Those who need the full occupation code for their research should contact the NES project staff for information about the conditions under which access may be provided.

Similarly, the National Election Studies have not included information for census tracts or minor civil divisions since 1978. Permission to use the more detailed geographic information for scholarly research may be obtained from the Board of Overseers. More information about this is available from NES project staff.

Coding of the new religious denomination variable is in some cases based on an alphabetic "other, please specify" variable. This variable is restricted for reasons of confidentiality, but access may be provided to legitimate scholars under established NES procedures.

OPEN-ENDED MATERIALS

Traditionally, the National Election Studies have contained several minutes of open-ended responses (for example, the candidate likes and dislikes). These questions are put into Master Codes by the SRC coding section. Other scholars have developed alternative or supplemental coding schemes for the questions (for example, the levels of conceptualization, released as ICPSR 8151). The Board of Overseers wishes to encourage these efforts but in ways which respect the NES and SRC obligation to protect the privacy and anonymity of respondents. Circumstances under which individuals may have access to transcribed versions of these questions have been worked out and those interested should contact the NES project staff for further details.

Table 1: Field Administration Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Rate:</th>
<th>71.4%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of Interview:</td>
<td>78.0 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Respondents:</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Number and Cumulative Percent of Interviews in Two-Week Intervals from Election Day, 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nov. 07-Nov. 17</th>
<th>Nov. 18-Dec. 01</th>
<th>Dec. 02-Dec. 22</th>
<th>Dec. 23-Jan. 05</th>
<th>Jan. 06-Jan. 26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES

{There are no notes [1] - [4]}

[5] There were actually three forms of both questionnaires, since they were translated in Spanish. The Spanish language questionnaires are also "short-form" since only core items
were translated. They are not, however, treated as "short-form" for "partials" for the purpose of this discussion.

[6] The denominator for the calculations in this paragraph are as given in Tables 14 and 15 this Introduction. Information about the numerators appears in Table 7.


[8] While the Panel segments were selected from the 1980 STF1B file, most of the Cross-section segments were selected from the nearly equivalent 1990 Census file (PL94-171 file on CD ROM) which contains the block-level 1990 Census housing unit (HU) data. At the time of selection the 1990 STF1B file was not available. Therefore, the PL94-171 file was used, which had "total HU's" (rather than "occupied HU's") per block; for these Cross-section segments, linkage was designed to achieve a minimum measure of 72 TOTAL HU's per SSU. Also, since in 1990 all areas had been divided into Census Tracts and blocks, no Enumeration Districts were involved as SSU's. In other respects the second stage selection was the same for both sets of area segments.


[10] The 1986 NES was the most recent NES sample using the two-thirds National Sample. Response rate in 1986 was .701 and occupancy eligibility rate was .835.


[12] About 55% of the base sample was assigned to the first release, September 1, 1992.


[14] All "reserve" replicates were to have coversheets sent to the field October 1, 1992, in sealed envelopes which were not to be opened by the interviewers until notified of their "release". As it happened, it was decided to release Replicates 4 and 5 on October 1, 1992. Replicate 3 was never released. (However, a few cases from Replicate 3 were released by mistake; these cases can be identified by using variables 3023 and 3024.)

[15] An overall Panel response rate of 75% was assumed. Based on recontact response to the 1991 Persian Gulf Study: 1385 cases at 87% response rate = 1205 cases, and 615 cases at 50% response rate = 308 cases. Therefore, Overall: 1513/2000 = .756

[16] See Note 12.

[17] Based on 1986 NES field experience using the two-thirds National Sample (.835).
[18] No provision of update growth was applied in early estimates. Since the updating process was applied to the cross-section component of the 1992 NES Sample, and since it typically produces about 3% increase in sample lines over the count selected from the National Sample system, the update inflation factor was set at 1.03 for the cross-section component.

[19] One percent of the sample was lost due to subsampling in three locked and two dangerous areas.

[20] An overall Panel response rate of 75% was assumed, based on previous recontact experience (response to the 1991 Persian Gulf Study): 1385 cases at 87% response rate = 1205 cases, and 615 cases at 50% response rate = 308 cases. Overall: 1513/2000 = .756

[21] This figure was left without applying the usual growth factor for updating to the cross-section component of the sample, since this was the the table presented (see Table 11) in the original planning for the study. The equivalent figure for the actually released Replicates 1, 2, 4 and 5) was taken with the growth factor of 1.03 applied to the cross-section component only.

[22] In constructing the analysis weight, a maximum of three eligible adults was allowed.

[23] For cross-sectional analysis of the 1992 NES data the combined cross-section and panel data must be used. Cross-section component data cannot be used alone.

[24] The design effects from the 1988 NES are expected to be similar to those for the 1992 NES. Sampling errors for the 1992 NES have not yet been run.

[25] The standard error of a percentage is a symmetric function with its maximum centered at p=50%; i.e., the standard error of p=40% and p=60% estimates are equal.

>> Study Design, Content, and Administration 1993 PILOT

SURVEY CONTENT AND OBJECTIVES

Overview

The 1993 Pilot Study is the second of a projected three wave study. The 1993 wave was in the field approximately one year after the first wave of the study which is the 1992 Pre- and Post-election study, from which the 1005 cross-section respondents were selected for reinterview in 1993. We anticipate that respondents will be interviewed for a third time as part of the 1994 Election Study. The three-wave study is designed to exploit the special circumstances of the 1992-94 elections: a minority president who is struggling to forge a majority coalition in the face of a strong third-party challenge, and the replacement in 1992 of fully one-quarter of the House of Representatives. Each presents an unique opportunity which we propose to seize through projects that are directed at understanding how electoral coalitions form (and decay) and how new members of the House secure their districts.
Additionally, the Pilot Study fulfills its role as the vehicle for testing and developing new instrumentation for the 1994 National Election Study.

The Clinton Coalition

The 1994 elections present both a substantial opportunity and risk to the Democratic Party. The stakes are high: the party needs to consolidate the gains of 1992 and build a majority coalition. In some ways, the Clinton Administration began this political task from a position of extraordinary weakness. Although Bill Clinton captured a clear majority of the electoral votes, he entered the White House without a clear mandate, winning just a shade over 43 percent of the popular vote. Indeed, early interpretations of the 1992 election have emphasized less that Clinton won the Presidency and more that Bush lost it.

At the same time, whether in possession of a popular mandate or not, Clinton came to Washington with significant legislative initiatives in mind. He introduced major proposals on taxes and spending. He appears determined to grapple with health care, not to tinker with it but to reform it fundamentally. Clinton's election has of course meant the return of unified government to the national scene, though early readings suggest that Republican unity in the Senate and Democratic defections from Clinton's proposals may undermine the promises of unified control. Still, there is the prospect of real change: major proposals, passed into law, with the consequences broadly felt throughout the country.

From the perspective of coalition maintenance, this is a special political moment, one portentous for the future electoral success not only of the Democratic and Republican Parties but for third party challenges as well (a point we take up immediately below). We want to assess how all this consequential and high-profile political churning intrudes upon Clinton's capacity to hold together and expand his political coalition over the first critical years of his administration. How have each of Clinton's major policy initiatives added or subtracted support from his political coalition?

The 1993 Pilot Study re-asks a number of items from the 1992 Study, and adds others, to give as complete a picture as possible of how Clinton is faring with the coalition which elected him. These items are:

- Evaluation of economy (V7238-7260)
- Approval ratings of several aspects of Clinton's performance in office (V7101-7120)
- Thermometer ratings of Bill and Hillary Clinton (V7130-7138)
- Who would R vote for if the election were held today (V7161)
- Liberal-conservative placement of Clinton (V7209-7216)
- Traits and affects batteries (V7226-7230, V7267-7270)
- Opinion on NAFTA (V7261-7266)
- Opinion on budget deficit (V7315-7323)
From a slightly different angle, the 1992-1994 study, of which the 1993 Pilot Study is the middle piece, is also directed at more fully understanding the Perot phenomenon. That Perot's popularity is a political phenomenon is hardly open to question. Following an eccentric if not quixotic on and off and on again campaign, and in spite of the formidable hurdles which the American system places before third-party candidates, Perot won nearly one in five votes cast in 1992. In this respect, Perot did better than all but one third party candidate since the Civil War split the nation.

Perot's pockets are deep enough to finance a continued high public profile. Perot's likely continued presence quickens interest on our part in understanding the maintenance and decay of his coalition as well. Even without the trappings and formal powers of the Presidency, Perot, like Clinton, faces the identical political problem of somehow hanging on to his supporters while recruiting still others as they become disenchanted with the alternatives.

To what extent does Perot's continued support rest upon an ideological base? Or upon disenchantment with business as usual, a continuing protest against politics itself? Or upon the failure of government to deal with the economy or the budget deficit? Or should the Perot movement be understood in more personal terms, dependent upon continuing public displays of a winning style and personality? Or, finally, does it turn on contempt for the alternatives?

A number of items which attempt to tap the sources and strength of Perot support have been included in the study. They include:

- Ross Perot and United We Stand feeling thermometers (V7131, V7149, V7150)
- Liberal-conservative placement for Perot (V7220-7221)
- Traits and affects batteries (V7231-7235, V7271-7274)
- Attitudes toward political parties ((V7295-7296, V7305, V7366-7370)
- Attitudes toward media, special interests, government in Washington (V7306-V7308)
- Membership in, contact by United We Stand America (V7312-7314)

To examine the maintenance and decay of electoral coalitions, we have empaneled the cross-section respondents to the 1992 NES Post-Election Survey, interviewing them again in the fall of 1993, and proposing to interview them one final time in the weeks following the 1994 midterm election. The panel design is a powerful one for several reasons. First, an absolute requirement for a study of electoral coalitions is the successful identification of Clinton, Perot, and Bush voters (and non-voters as well). For Clinton, the immediate political challenge has several aspects: to maintain the support of those who voted for him in 1992; to build support among those who voted for his opponents, especially those who went Perot's way in 1992; and to awaken interest and eventually support among those millions who, in 1992, voted for no one at all. Attempting to assess vote a year or more away from the election, as we would have to do absent a panel design, invites error of the
most pernicious sort. For example, citizens who in fact voted for Clinton in 1992 but who have since recoiled in horror at what he has done, might now report that they had voted for Bush. To get this project off the ground, we need to know what citizens did on election day 1992, and to know that, we treat the 1992 NES Survey as a first wave of a panel.

Second, coalition maintenance and decay may be a classic case of little detectable movement at the aggregate level obscuring lots of off-setting movement at the individual level, as citizens move in and out of various partisan camps. Determining the fluidity of the Clinton and Perot coalitions can be uncovered with panel evidence.

Finally, panel data will also permit the testing of alternative theories of political learning. Whether such theories come from formal, statistical formulations, as in Bayesian models, or from various psychological theories, a claim held in common is that what people absorb from their political experiences depends on their prior beliefs and sentiments. Learning is conditional on what citizens already know. This means that we must have baseline readings on citizens before Clinton's coming to power. The 1992 NES survey of course delivers handsomely on precisely this point. These data tell us what citizens thought in 1992 about the necessity of new taxes, the seriousness of the federal budget deficit, the need for health care reform, the conditions under which women should be permitted to have abortions, whether gays should be allowed to serve in the armed forces, the responsiveness of government institutions, the performance of the major parties, and much, much more. And this means that, having returned to these same citizens in 1993 and 1994, we will be in excellent position to understand in a fine-grained way how electoral coalitions are held together and how they fall apart.

Securing the District

Due to a combination of re-districting, scandal, and retirement, the 1992 House elections resulted in a dramatic turnover in personnel. More than one-quarter of the House was replaced: 110 new Representatives won in November, the most in nearly half a century. This turnover provides an opportunity of examining the ways in which new members of the House secure their districts against challenge in the next election. For the first time, we can examine the relationship that develops between representatives and their constituents in its formative stages during the first term in office.

The advantages of incumbency have been a central theme of research on House elections and on the institution itself. Defections from party-line voting in House elections have increasingly favored the incumbent. These days, incumbent Representatives almost always win, often by overwhelming margins. Despite all the talk about anti-incumbent feelings in 1992, fully 93 percent of House incumbents seeking re-election were returned to office. Taking into account primary election defeats, this figure remains an impressive 88 percent. On the other hand, this re-election rate was the lowest since the Watergate election of 1974 and fell just 2 points short of being the lowest in forty years. Moreover, it does not take into account the unusually large number of representatives who choose not to run again in 1992, some of whom certainly would have been defeated. It is also true that winning incumbents were much more likely to find themselves in close contests in 1992 than in previous years. Still, in the face of re-districting, scandal, and widespread popular disdain for the institution of Congress, incumbents seeking re-election were rarely turned away. Success at under these highly unfavorable conditions testifies to the continuing electoral benefits of incumbency.
We know that incumbent advantage accrues quickly: it is well-established, perhaps established in full, by completion of the first term in office. Indeed, a common measure of incumbency advantage is the "sophomore surge:" the gain typically registered in the representative's first re-election try. What happens during these first two years? How do newly elected members of the House consolidate their victories? Is the incumbency advantage secured as a result of the actions that members of Congress engage in during their first term of office, or is it secured as a result of their first re-election campaign? As it is typically investigated, the problem is impossible to unravel. The data we rely on are always investigated in the context of an election campaign. Moreover, it is precisely those incumbents who are deepest in trouble at election time who work their district the most.

The study we propose here provides a clean test of the inherent (as opposed to campaign-related) advantages of incumbency. Many new members are precarious, and most no doubt believe that they are. Under these circumstances, do in fact new members of the House concentrate their attention and activities on their home district during their first term and, most important, do their constituents take notice?

As a general matter, we know next to nothing about the impressions created by Representatives -- whether they are new to Congress or not--between elections. What in fact happens to the visibility of newly-elected representatives over the critical period of their first term? Do constituents tend to forget about their representatives between elections, and then learn about them again as the next campaign takes off? Or do constituents learn more and more about their representatives as the first term proceeds, a response to what Richard Fenno has called "the permanent campaign?"

The 1992-1993-1994 panel data provide sharp tests of the alternative theoretical interpretations of the incumbency advantage. Of the 1005 respondents who make up the 1992 NES post-election cross-section, over a quarter (n=275) resided in congressional districts that sent a new member to Congress in 1992. Thus, the high turnover that occurred in the House in 1992 provides sufficient numbers of respondents to support detailed analysis of the processes by which newly-elected representatives (compared to returning incumbents) shore up their support during their first term in office. The panel design provides efficient measurement of the evolution of new Representatives' reputations among their constituents. With panel evidence in hand, patterns of learning and forgetting and alterations in trust and support, conditional on the views held by constituents before their Representatives went off to Washington, can be traced.

The survey included extensive content on evaluations of incumbent members of Congress. Much of the content repeats the now-familiar congressional batteries. Also embedded in the study is an experiment designed to give us more information about whether the use of the ballot card has contributed to over-reporting. Half of the respondents were supplied with the names as well as parties of the candidates for congress when asked for whom they voted. This emulates the ballot card. The other half of the respondents were simply asked whether they voted for the Democrat or the Republican candidate. 

Recall of candidates running in "this district this past November" (V7121-7129)

Thermometer rating of incumbent; recall what job he/she holds? (V7136-7137)
Likes/dislikes of incumbent (V7162-7173)
Contact with U.S. Representative incumbent (V7174-7183)
Vote for Representative (V7184-7185)
Approve of way Representative handling job (V7191-7194)
Does R's representative support Clinton's legislative proposals (V7195-V7199)
Did he/she vote for Clinton's deficit reduction package (V7200-7202)
Does Representative do a good job of keeping in touch (V7203)
Liberal-conservative placement of Representative (V7222-7223)

Developing New Instrumentation

The design of the 1993 Pilot Study replicates one NES successfully implemented in 1990-91-92 to assess the political impact of the Persian Gulf War. In this design, the odd-year Pilot Study serves double duty as a platform both from which to conduct the second wave of the panel and to carry out the research and development work for the subsequent year's election study.

One section of development work (variables 7371-7422) follows a proposal made by Laura Stoker, to study the interest basis of political attitudes. Questions are asked about perceived interests of several groups (wealthy, poor, middle class, blacks, whites), as well as self and national interest, in three domains:

- National health insurance (V7374-7384)
- Affirmative action (V7405-7422)
- School choice (V7385-7404)

Half of the respondents received the questions about affirmative action in lieu of the school choice questions while the other half got the school choice questions instead of those relating to affirmative action.

Douglas Strand proposed a number of questions relating to attitudes toward homosexuals and about policies affecting homosexuals. The attitudes toward homosexuals are measured by asking Rs whether:

- Parents should encourage boys to be masculine and girls to be feminine (V7289-7294)
- Homosexuality is a matter of choice (V7336-7339)
- Homosexuals try to seduce non-homosexuals (V7340-7343)
- The idea of homosexuality disgusting or uncomfortable (V7348-7351)
He/she worries about getting AIDS or other disease from homosexuals (V7348-7351)

Homosexuality is unnatural (V7352-7355)

Homosexuals have too much/too little influence (V7356-7360)

Homosexuality is against the will of God (V7361-7365)

Attitudes towards policy relating to homosexuals are measured by these items:

Favor or oppose laws protecting homosexuals from job discrimination (V7324-7327)

Whether homosexuals should serve in military (V7328-7331)

Should homosexual couples be allowed to adopt children (V7332-7335)

A number of experiments in the survey response also are included in the Pilot Study. These include:

Budget package vs. deficit reduction package (V7200)

Experiment in wording of the vote choice for Representative question-reading candidate name as well as party, versus reading only party labels (V7185, V7283)

Reversing order of self versus political object placement on liberal conservative 7-pt scale (V7205-7219)

Certainty probe on liberal-conservative scale; self and other objects (V7208, V7211, V7216, V7219, V7221, V7223)

Experiments on nature of follow-up: strength versus amount (lot, little) (V7263, V7266, V7291, V7294, V7300, V7308)

Experiments on length of follow-ups: short versus verbose ((V7102-7104, V7349-7351) order in which groups were presented in the interest basis of politics section was reversed for half the sample (V7374-7422)

STUDY CHARACTERISTICS AND ADMINISTRATION

The 1993 Pilot Study was a telephone reinterview of (cross-section) respondents to the NES 1992 Pre- and Post-Election Study. Interviewing was carried out by the Telephone Facility of the Survey Research Center, the Institute for Social Research.
Field period was Sept. 23 -- Nov. 24, 1993
Average interview length was 42 minutes
750 interviews were taken, including 4 partials
Response rate was 74.6 percent; cooperation rate was 88.4 percent (See below)
The study was CATI -- there is no paper version of the Questionnaire

Response Rate Calculations
This is a Panel Study, and response rate calculations are somewhat different than those for an initial contact study, primarily because there is no "non-sample" category. Every one of the 1005 persons we originally interviewed in the 1992 Post-electoral study is, by definition, eligible for a reinterview. (1992 respondents who were interviewed in the Pre-electoral study only were not part of the 1993 study sample.) We reinterviewed 750 of these 1005 respondents to the 1992 study, for a strictly construed reinterview rate of 74.6 percent. 98 respondents from the 1990 Study refused to be reinterviewed. An additional 157 respondents could not cooperate because they were ill or for some other reason physically unable to complete a telephone interview; because they were not locatable; or because they did not have a telephone and did not respond to our requests to call the Telephone Facility. A cooperation rate, which excludes the 157 noninterview cases, is calculated at 88.4 percent.

The Telephone Facility and NES staff collaborated on a several step plan to boost response rate and to reduce panel attrition. There were several mailings to the respondents, including a thank-you letter, a respondent report, and an advance contact letter enclosing a small clock as an incentive. The field period was long enough to provide time to track respondents. Persuasion letters were sent, to those who were initially reluctant to participate. An 800-number was set up for respondents to call for further information about the study. In the late stages of interviewing, monetary incentives were offered to 42 reluctant respondents. Finally, the study benefitted from having a highly committed and skilled cadre of interviewers.

Interviewer training, pretesting and debriefings
The first draft of the questionnaire was pretested by picking at random telephone numbers from local (not Ann Arbor) telephone exchanges. 30 interviewers were taken in this way by a mixture of experienced and new interviewers. Study staff "debriefed" the interviewers on their own and respondents' reactions to each question in the pretest instrument. These pretest interviews were also tape recorded, and new questions were "behavior coded" for more quantitative indications of problems with these questions. A separate debriefing was held for the behavior coders. Information from both of these debriefings (which were contradictory on certain points) was incorporated into the production instrument.

Standard practice for an SRC study calls for a study guide, listing study objectives and procedures, as well as any special information that interviewers need to know about specific questions. (A copy of this document, as well as study guides for all previous studies, is available from NES Project Staff.) Prestudy conferences with all interviewers and NES staff and PIs gave an opportunity to train on specific questions, and answer concerns of interviewers. Midway through the interviewing, NES staff and PI met with interviewers to hear directly from them how the study was proceeding and how, in their opinion, new sections of the questionnaire were working. A full
Forms Assignment

When the Board began planning for this study, we were budgeted for about 40 minutes of interview time, and a number of experiments were proposed. In order to meet these objectives, respondents were randomly assigned to one of four forms. (Variable 7003 records the form assignment.)

Randomization

Responses to survey questions can be affected by questions that have been asked previously in the survey. There are many survey questions, like the feeling thermometers, where lists of objects are presented for evaluation by respondents. It is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to identify a single order for the items which eliminates response effects. An alternative is to randomize the order in which items on a list are presented to respondents. The CATI system used by the SRC Telephone Facility, AUTOQUEST, has a randomizing function and this was implemented for the feeling thermometer (variables V7130-7136, 7138-7141). No information as to the order in which the thermometer items were asked for a given respondent was preserved.

Congressional District Identification for Movers

One of the goals of the multiple advance mailings to the 1992 respondents was to get change of address information from local post offices. When we got information that a respondent had moved, and to where, study staff attempted to determine, from what was known of the respondent's new location, in which congressional district the respondent now lived. The name of the member of Congress for that district was then substituted throughout the questionnaire for the name of the member of Congress who was elected in the district in which the respondent lived at the time of the 1992 interview. In a few cases, the information that the respondent had moved was not elicited until the interview was actually underway. When this happened, the interview continued, using the original member of Congress.

Organization and Documentation of the Dataset

Data for all of the variables and all of the cases in the first wave of the panel, i.e., the 1992 Pre- and Post-election Study, are included in this dataset. Please note that this means that although there are 750 respondents in the 1993 Pilot Study, there are actually 1005 records in the Pilot dataset; one for each (cross-section) respondent to the 1992 Post-election Study. Respondents in the 1992 study who were not re-interviewed in the 1993 wave are assigned missing data codes on the 1993 variables.

Documentation for the 1993 Study is separate from the documentation (i.e., codebook) for the 1992 Election Study. Since the variable numbers for the 1992 wave of the study re the same in the Study Staff and the Consortium Releases of the 1992 Election Study, users may use whichever version of that documentation they now have. Users who do not have any 1992 documentation available to them should specify that fact when ordering. The documentation for the 1993 wave is hard-copy, but users may also receive the documentation as WordPerfect 5.2 files or as an ASCII text file.

The dataset is an ASCII, raw data file accompanied by SAS/SPSS control cards. There is no OSIRIS dataset.
>> Study Design, Content, and Administration 1994 POST

STUDY DESIGN

The 1994 Election Study was designed to be simultaneously the third wave in a three wave panel, which began in 1992, and also a stand-alone cross-section data collection in the traditional NES time-series. Thus, there are two components to the 1994 Post-election Study: one is a fresh cross-section component, comprising 1136 respondents who were interviewed for the first time in the weeks following the November 8, 1994 general election, and the other is a set of 759 respondents who were initially interviewed in the 1992 Pre-election Study. All of these respondents were interviewed in the 1992 Post-Election Study, and 635 of the panel respondents also gave us an interview in the 1993 Pilot Study. The full set of 1795 respondents may be treated, with appropriate weighting, as a fully representative national cross-section.

The three-wave study was designed to exploit the special features of the 1992-1994 elections; a minority president struggling to forge a majority coalition in the face of a strong third-party challenge, and the replacement in 1992 of fully one-quarter of the House of Representatives. The design themes of the 1992-1994 Panel became particularly salient because of the electoral earthquake of the 1994 election, when the Republicans gained control of both houses of Congress first time since 1952.

The datafile has been enhanced, for panel respondents, with data from the 1992 and 1993 studies. Data from these earlier studies may be thought of as 'lagged' measures, for use in analysis of 1994 panel respondents. For a full description of the 1992 and 1993 study designs and content, the user is referred to the Appendices to this documentation, which contain the complete original study descriptions as they appear in the documentation for these studies.

Of the 1005 respondents who make up the 1992 NES post-election cross-section, (from which the 1992-93-94 Panel respondents were drawn) over a quarter resided in congressional districts that sent a new member to congress in 1992. Thus, the high turnover that occurred in the House in 1992 provides sufficient numbers of respondents to support detailed analysis of the processes by which newly-elected representatives shore up, or fail to shore up their support during their first term in office.

The congressional battery that has been in place in NES studies since 1978 was the chief vehicle used in 1992, 1993 and 1994 to evaluate respondents' attitudes towards Congress and their congressional representatives. (For 1993, these questions were modified as necessary to refer to "last November"s election and to the incumbent rather than to the congressional candidates). These questions include:

* what respondents like and dislike about congressional candidates

* whether and how they have been contacted by the candidates for summary evaluations ( feeling'
thermometers) of the candidates, whether they can recall congressional candidates (1993: running in this district this past November)

* whether they have had contact with the incumbent candidate

* where they place congressional candidates on several issue dimensions

* for their evaluations of congressional performance

* what the most important issue discussed in the congressional campaign in their district

The core battery of congressional evaluations was supplemented by questions on term limits, (1992 and 1994) on the representative's vote on President Clinton's crime bill, (1994), or on the Persian Gulf war resolution (1992), on Clinton's deficit reduction package (1993), whether their Representative was implicated in the House banking scandal (1992) and on whether the respondent felt that his representative cared more about prestige and influence for him/herself rather than solving the problems of the congressional district (1994).

Another major theme of the 1992-1993-1994 Panel is the assessment of how well the "Clinton coalition" is faring. The 1992 Study, since it occurred in a Presidential year, had a full set of items bearing on the evaluation of candidate Clinton, some of which were repeated in 1993 and 1994. These repeated items include:

* Summary evaluations (feeling thermometer) of Clinton
* Traits and affects for Clinton
* Placement of Clinton on several issue dimensions (92 and 94 only)
* Placement of Clinton on liberal-conservative dimension
* approval ratings of several aspects of Clinton's performance in office (93 and 94 only)
* For whom R voted (92); recall of Presidential vote (94)
* Evaluation of the economy

Each of the studies includes specific measures relating to evaluation of Clinton, including likes/dislikes in 1992, opinion about NAFTA and the federal budget deficit in 1993, who the respondent would vote for if the election were held today (1993).

Emphasis on the panel aspects of the design should not obscure the fact that the 1994 data can be used to support cross-sectional analyses of the 1994 electorate. Note that almost all of the items listed below were also asked in the 1992 Election Study.

* Campaign interest
* Media exposure
* Measures of partisanship (party likes/dislikes and party identification), which party would better handle certain public problems

* Summary evaluations (feeling thermometers) on major political figures and social groups
* Voting behavior

* Views on issues: most important problem and several issue dimensions, including defense spending, assistance to blacks, spending and services trade-off, health insurance, women's role, and recent proposals to reform welfare.

* Preferences on federal budget allocations

* Electoral participation

* Retrospective and prospective national and personal economic evaluations

* Liberal-conservative self-placement

* Political information held by respondent

* Values, including moral traditionalism, egalitarianism, and attitudes toward race, as well as individual items on school prayer and abortion

* Religious affiliation and behavior

* Occupation, work force status, home ownership and residential mobility, nationality, education, income, and number of children being raised.

The 1992 Election Study, in addition to the topics already mentioned, included questions on social altruism and social connectedness of the respondent; assessments of U.S. involvement in the Persian Gulf War and U.S. foreign policy goals; opinions of the respondent about racial and ethnic stereotypes, on school integration and affirmative action; attitudes towards immigrants (particularly Hispanics and Asians); opinions on immigration policy and bilingual education; and opinions on the rights of homosexuals; on sexual harassment and women's rights.

In addition to the congressional and Clinton evaluations already mentioned, the 1993 Pilot Study included a number of items intended to tap the sources and strength of support for Ross Perot.

As a pilot study, the 1993 Study included developmental work in a number of areas. One such area is the interest group basis of political attitudes. Questions were asked about the perceived interests of several groups (wealthy, poor, middle class, blacks, whites), as well as self and national interest in three domains: national health insurance, affirmative action, and school choice. The 1993 Study also includes a number of questions relating to attitudes toward homosexuals, and about policies affecting homosexuals. Finally, a number of experiments in the survey response were implemented in the study, including:

* an experiment in wording of the vote choice for Representative question

* reversing order of self versus political object placement on liberal-conservative 7-pt scale
Field Periods

Like the 1992 Pre-and Post-Election Study, the 1994 study design involved face-to-face, paper and pencil interviews of respondents randomly selected from the SRC's national area probability sample. The 1994 field period was November 9, 1994 through January 9, 1995, with 40% of the 1795 interviews taken in the first week, and 68% of the interviews within three weeks of the November 8 General Election. This is a significant improvement over the performance of the 1992 Post Election Study, in which only 42.3% of the Post-Election interviews were taken at the end of three weeks.

In the 1992 Pre-Election Study, 2485 citizens were interviewed in person in the 9 weeks prior to the November 3, 1992 election of whom 1126 were cross section respondents. To permit analysis of the impact of the unfolding election campaign, a random half of the sample was released to the field on September 1 and the other half on October 1. In the weeks following the election, 2255 pre-election respondents were reinterviewed; 1005 of them were cross-section.

Sample Replicates

To more closely tailor the field effort to the actual sample performance, NES samples are randomly divided into "replicates" of varying sizes. The usual practice is hold some replicates in reserve. In 1992, additional replicates for both panel and cross section were released midway through the Pre-Election field period; in 1994, all panel sample was released at the beginning of the field period. It did not prove necessary to release additional cross-section replicates.

Response Rates for the 1994 Election Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1994 Post Election</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-Section</td>
<td>1036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel</td>
<td>759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>1795</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes on the 1993 Pilot Study

The 1993 Pilot Study was a telephone reinterview of cross-section respondents to the NES 1992 Pre- and Post-election Study. Interviewing was carried out by the Telephone Facility of the Survey Research Center, the Institute for Social Research. The Field period was Sept. 23 - Nov. 24, 1993, roughly halfway between the 1992 and 1994 Election Studies. 750 interviews were taken, with a response rate of 74.6%. The study was CATI. The average interview length was 42 minutes. Because there were a number of experiments, each respondent was randomly assigned to one of four forms.
Randomization of the Feeling Thermometers in the 1993 Pilot Study

There are many survey questions, like the feeling thermometers, where lists of objects are presented for evaluation by respondents. It is extremely difficult, if not impossible to identify a single order for the items which eliminates response effects. An alternative is to randomize the order in which items on a list are presented to respondents. The AUTOQUEST CATI system has a randomizing function, and this was implemented for the feeling thermometers in the 1993 Pilot Study. No information as to the order in which the thermometer items were asked for a given respondent was preserved.

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT IDENTIFICATION AND CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATES

Congressional Ballot Cards, Candidate Lists, and Candidate Numbers

In all NES Post-Election surveys since 1978, respondents have been asked several questions about their particular Congresspersons and Senators. These questions in the survey require the insertion by the interviewer, during pre-editing, of the names of candidates. See, for example, question B11, which includes feeling thermometers for the various candidates. Each candidate and Senator is assigned a unique number that reflects his or her incumbency status and party. (See MASTER CODES Candidate Number). The Candidate Lists used by the interviewers, which show which candidates are associated with which congressional district and with which numbers they are tagged, are Notes 4 and 5 in the Master Codes section of this documentation.

Congressional District Determination

From 1978 through 1990, the congressional district in which an NES sample segment was located was determined by the SRC's sampling section. This was usually done by comparing very detailed maps of the sample segment and of congressional districts. Congressional district determination for the 1992 and 1994 studies presented complications due to the massive redistricting following the 1990 U.S. Census, and due to its panel nature -- movers had to be tracked and their new district determined.

Handling of Congressional Incumbency Where Redistricting has Occurred (1992)

Throughout the documentation for the 1992 study, whenever the word "incumbent" is used, its referent is a representative who was a member of the 102nd Congress; i.e., the Congress in session prior to the November 1992 General Election. Due to redistricting, any given incumbent's district for the 103rd Congress may consist of a fairly different geographical area from the area covered by the district prior to the boundary changes. Therefore, prior to 1992, the "incumbent" may or may not have been the representative for the particular piece of geography (the sample segment or census tract) in which the respondent lives. For each sample segment, we have included in the dataset its 1992 congressional district number, v3019, and its congressional district number in 1990, v3020. By comparing the two, it can be determined whether the "incumbent" in question was actually the respondent's incumbent prior to the 1992 general election.

Congressional District Assignments For Movers
Respondents to the 1992 Post-election Study were the recipients of several mailings, which we used to track address changes, and minimize panel attrition due to "lost" respondents. When the United States Post Office returned information indicating that respondents had changed their addresses, the study staff attempted to determine, usually by calling local election offices, in which congressional district the respondent now lived. The substantive decision, for 1993 and for 1994 panel waves, was to ask the R to evaluate the congressional candidates in the district in which h/she was now living, and about whom h/she was presumably receiving information.

In some instances, information about where a respondent was now living was not available until the field period, when interviewers were able to track the respondents by talking to former neighbors, etc. In 1994, the interviewers were instructed to contact local electoral offices directly to determine if R's change of address involved also a change of congressional district. A candidate list for R's new district was then prepared, and used to pre-edit the respondent's questionnaire. A similar procedure was used in the 1993 Pilot Study.

A Reliability Check of Congressional District Assignments

Since one of the chief themes of the 1992-93-94 Panel Study is the evaluation over time of respondents' attitudes toward their congressional representatives, and because of the complications of following movers and of redistricting, NES staff made an intensive effort to assess the both the accuracy and the stability of congressional district assignments. Their findings will appear as Technical Report 52, "Accuracy and Stability of Congressional District Assignments in the 1992-93-94 National Election Studies." That report will be available by early June, 1995.

For the 1994 Election Study, we decided to send the entire set of sample segment selections to an outside source for computerized matching of congressional district boundaries and the Census geocodes for the SRC sample segments. In this process, we completely checked the 1992 Congressional District assignments. Approximately 71, or 2.8% of the 1992 respondents (N = 2485) were assigned to the wrong congressional district, because of errors in the original determination of the district (misreading maps, incorrect information from local election offices, etc.) These misassignments were corrected for the 1994 field work, but not for the 1993 Pilot Study, where 4.5% of the 750 respondents were misassigned. In both the 1992 and 1994 Studies, all other causes of being asked about the wrong congressional candidates (e.g., wrongly pre-edited questionnaires, inappropriate determination of congressional districts for movers) totaled less than one percent of the respondents.

More important than these errors is the simple question of the stability of the congressional objects themselves. The candidates we ask the respondent to evaluate can change, because a) the respondent moves; b) his/her incumbent does not stand for re-election, or c) there is redistricting, respondent lives. 3% of the panel respondents were affected by 1993 and 1994 redistricting, so that they were not asked to evaluate the same candidates in 1992 and 1994. Incumbents did not run in the general election for 15% of the panel cases, so the congressional candidates they were asked to evaluate in 1994 were different than 1993 or 1992. About 8% of the panel respondents moved between their initial 1992 interview and the 1994 Election Study.
Finally, it should be noted that about 3% of the 1994 respondents are registered in districts different than the one in which they were interviewed. Consequently, their vote choice was between a different set of candidates than those about whom they were asked. This dataset contains a number of variables, v22-v32, v80, v7004, and V7007, which record the various contingencies discussed above. Users interested in more detail about these matters should request Technical Report 52 from NES Project Staff.

Study Design, Content, and Administration 1995 PILOT

Study Design

The 1995 Pilot Study was conducted between August 3 and September 10th, 1995. The study is a one-wave reinterview of a randomly selected subset of respondents with telephones from the fresh cross section portion of the 1994 Post-Election Study. 1994 "panel" respondents who had been interviewed in 1992 were not eligible for reinterview in the 1995 Pilot Study. The randomly selected sample consisted of 704 respondents from 1994; 486 of these respondents agreed to be interviewed in 1995.

The response rate is thus .69 (486/704). The number of refusals was 95. The remainder of the non-interviews are persons with whom contact was lost, or who were unavailable during the study period, for such reasons as illness or absence from home. The study mode was Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing, or CATI. The average interview length was 44.8 minutes.

Study Content

The content of the study reflects the NES commitment to improve measures of candidate evaluation, the impact of the campaign, values and predispositions, the comparative study of elections, and other responses to a stimulus letter calling for ideas for content sent to the user community on November 4, 1994.

Specific topic areas in the study include:

* an experiment between different measures of affective reactions to political figures
* a module of items that are being concurrently tested in many other nations as part of a comparative study of politics
* a set of 12 items asking respondents to make tradeoffs between programs, taxes and the budget deficit
* a set of items designed to measure attitudes toward the environment and environmental policy
* a new measure of "humanitarianism"
* an extensive set of items re attention to the media, intended to capture exposure to the political campaigns.

In order to include all of the content, and also in order to test between competing instrumentation, there were two forms of the questionnaire.

Rosters of items, such as the thermometer, were randomized in administration, to minimize order effects.
Because the 486 Pilot Study respondents had also been interviewed in the 1994 Post Election Study, their data from that study has been merged onto the datafile. There are 486 cases in the dataset (in other words, 1994 respondents who were not reinterviewed in 1995 are not included in the dataset).

The dataset is an ASCII, or "raw" dataset, accompanied by SAS and SPSS control cards. Missing data definition cards are also included.

Documentation for the 1995 Pilot Study is available as an ASCII text file. 1994 Post-Election Study documentation is available on the NES CD-ROM. It will shortly be accessible at http://www.icpsr.umich.edu or through the NES Home Page: http://www.umich.edu/~nes. It is not included as part of the 1995 Pilot Study release.

>> Study Design, Content, and Administration 1996 PRE-POST

STUDY DESIGN

The 1996 National Election Study entailed both a pre-election interview and a post-election re-interview. About three-fourths of the 1996 cases consist of empaneled respondents who were first interviewed in the 1994 or 1992 National Election Study. A freshly drawn cross-section sample makes up the balance of the 1996 cases. (Details of the sample design are given in "Sample Design of the 1996 Pre/Post Election Studies", in Appendix C. Altogether, 1714 citizens were interviewed in the 9 weeks prior to the November 5, 1996 election. To permit analysis of the impact of the unfolding election campaign, the pre-election sample was divided into four subsample replicates, which were released approximately two weeks apart. 1316 of the pre-election interviews were conducted with panel respondents; 398 with cross-section respondents. In the weeks following the election, 1534 pre-election respondents were reinterviewed: 1197 panel, 337 cross-section. This post-election survey included a mode experiment in which respondents were randomly assigned to be interviewed either by telephone or face-to-face. Further details of the administration of the surveys are given in "Study Administration", below.

The two components of the study -- the panel and the new cross-section -- were designed to be used together to create a combined nationally representative sample of the American electorate. The 1996 NES data set includes a weight which incorporates sampling, nonresponse and post-stratification factors, (V3), for analysis of the 1996 NES combined sample (Panel component cases plus Cross-section supplement cases). A Time Series Weight (V5) which corrects for Panel attrition (but does not incorporate sampling, nonresponse and post-stratification adjustments) should be used in analyses comparing either the panel respondents or the combined panel and new cross-section respondents to previous (unweighted) National Election Studies data collections. See "Sample Design of the 1996 Pre- and Post-Election Study", and the documentation for V3, and V5 for further information. The frequencies that appear in this codebook are unweighted. A set of files, data, weights, and data documentation, designed to enable panel analyses of the 1992-94-96 data become available sometime late in 1997; announcements concerning the release of data for panel analysis are found at the NES website, www.umich.edu/~nes. The present release has been prepared for cross-section and time series analyses.
The content for the 1996 Election Study reflects its double duty, both as the traditional presidential election year time-series data collection and as a panel study. Substantive themes represented in the 1996 questionnaires include:

- interest in the political campaigns; concern about the outcome; and attentiveness to the media's coverage of the campaign
- information about politics
- evaluation of the presidential candidates and placement of presidential candidates on various issue dimensions
- partisanship and evaluations of the political parties
- knowledge of and evaluation of House candidates
- political participation: turnout in the November general election; other forms of electoral campaign activity
- vote choice for President, the U.S. House, and the U.S. Senate, including second choice for President
- personal and national economic well-being
- positions on social welfare issues including: government health insurance; federal budget priorities, and the role of the government in the provision of jobs and good standard of living
- positions on social issues including: abortion; women's roles; prayer in the schools; the rights of homosexuals and the death penalty
- racial and ethnic stereotypes; opinions on affirmative action; attitudes towards immigrants
- opinions about the nation's most important problem
- values and predispositions: moral traditionalism; political efficacy; egalitarianism; humanitarianism individualism; trust in government
- social altruism and social connectedness
- feeling thermometers on a wide range of political figures and political groups; affinity with various social groups
- detailed demographic information and measures of religious affiliation and religiosity.

Several new themes are included in the 1996 study:

THE CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGN: To better understand the dynamics of congressional campaigns, the pre-election wave contains a core battery of campaign-related congressional items (including candidate recall, thermometer ratings, ideological placements, and vote intention).

ISSUE IMPORTANCE AND UNCERTAINTY: Several issue questions include "uncertainty" and "importance" follow-ups for both respondent selfplacements ("How certain are you of your position on this scale?") and candidate placements (e.g. "How certain are you of Bob Dole's position on this scale?" "How important is this issue to you?") and candidate placements (e.g. "How certain are you of Bob Dole's position on this scale?" "How important is this issue to Bob Dole?").

COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ELECTORAL SYSTEMS: An eight-minute module of questions developed by a consortium of electoral scholars from 52 polities is included in the post-election interview. Designed to facilitate comparative analysis of political attitudes and voting behavior, the same questions are being asked in similar form in national election studies around the world, and the resulting survey data will eventually be merged with contextual data on electoral laws and political institutions to produce a rich cross-national data set. This module is included as questions T1-T16 in the post-election survey.
ISSUE COVERAGE: New issue items in the areas of crime, the environment, gun control, and income inequality are included. A six-item battery carried forward from the 1995 Pilot Study taps respondents' reactions to proposed trade-offs among domestic spending, deficit reduction, and tax cuts.

THE ENVIRONMENT: New items from the 1995 Pilot Study tap perceptions of environmental conditions (air quality and the safety of drinking water in the nation and in the respondent's own community), environmental priorities (ranging from global warming to cleaning up lakes and parks), self-placements and placements of candidates and parties on environmental issues (trading off environmental protection against jobs and living standards, and supporting or opposing government environmental regulations on businesses), and the relative effectiveness of national, state, and local governments in dealing with environmental problems.

SOCIAL CAPITAL: Several measures of social connectedness are repeated from the 1992 survey. Items tapping trust in people and trust in government are repeated in the pre- and post-election waves to facilitate analysis of the effect of the campaign and election on broader social attitudes. A battery of items on membership and activity in a wide variety of social, political, religious, and civic organizations is included in the post-election questionnaire. This battery includes several questions on as many as four groups in each of twenty-two categories of organizations. Because of the large number of variables produced from these questions, two means of accessing these data are provided; one set of variables which summarize the groups data is available without any unusual effort by the user. A full complement of variables of interest to the specialist in groups membership and participation is also readily available by following instructions provided in Appendix A.

MEDIA EXPOSURE: New media exposure, reception, and attention items developed in the 1995 Pilot Study include talk radio items, more specific exposure items for network and local television news, and reception items asking respondents to match news anchors with the networks they work for. A battery of exposure items for entertainment television programs provides an indirect measure of exposure to campaign advertisements. There is also a new open-ended item on recollection of a memorable campaign ad, some expansion and reorganization of items tapping attention to the campaign in various media.

Congressional Ballot Cards, Candidate Lists, and Candidate Numbers

In the usual NES Post-Election survey, and for 1996, in the Pre-Election survey as well, respondents are asked several questions about their particular Congressional and Senators. In previous years, interviewers pre-edited questionnaires to fill in the names appropriate for the state and congressional district in which the respondent was living (or was living during the pre-election interview). The use of Computer-Assisted Interviewing software means that information about respondents' congressional district and about candidates and incumbents' names (including retiring incumbents) and parties is maintained and periodically updated in a computerized database; this information is loaded into the laptop computers used by interviewers and accessed to provide the correct CD and candidate information for displaying and entering responses to the relevant questions. Each candidate and Senator is assigned a unique number that reflects his or her incumbency status and party. (See Candidate Lists) Particular questions in the survey, which include feeling thermometers for the various candidates, automatically appear on screen with the correct name filled in. The Candidate Lists stored in the database, which show which candidates are associated with which congressional district and with which numbers they are tagged, can also be found here, as
can a sample ballot card. Candidates' names were identified by referring to the results of primary elections published in Congressional Quarterly. In the Pre-Election survey there is the additional complication that a number of states held their Congressional primaries after the Pre-Election field work had started. In these cases, the names of those candidates with the greatest chance of winning their party's nomination were loaded into the database. Forecasts of likely winners assumed that incumbents were likely to win their primaries and that unopposed non-incumbents would win. Other races were forecast by Board member Charles Franklin, using a probit model of all 1996 contested primaries involving non-incumbents and utilizing FEC data from August 1, 1996. As soon as the outcome of the primary was known, the correct candidate information was entered into the database and the new version was loaded onto the appropriate interviewers' laptop computers. In nearly all races the forecasted winner was correct. Further details can be found at the documentation for Pre-Election questions B2a and B2b.

Features of a CAI questionnaire

Using the capabilities of computer-assisted interviewing (CAI) in the 1996 NES enabled the introduction of several features that would not be feasible using a paper-and-pencil questionnaire. The most significant of these for users of this data are: randomization within batteries or sequences of questions; application of half-sampling to some questions; and random order of presentation of blocks of questions. Randomization within batteries refers to presenting, in a randomly determined order, a series of questions about the same objects (or people). An example would be the questions about the respondent's likes and dislikes of the three main Presidential candidates where the names of Clinton, Dole and Perot were inserted randomly as the first, second or third person to be asked about in this series. Randomization of names/objects in this way avoids ordering effects that might be obtained if, for example, the candidates were always asked about in the same order in every series of questions where a parallel question is asked about each of the three. Questions where randomization of order within a series was in force are clearly identified in the codebook. Randomization variables, which allow the user to identify the order of presentation, are provided for all instances of randomized presentation. A few questions, primarily open-ended questions, were half-sampled, so that a randomly selected half of respondents were asked the question. Finally, an order experiment, where a sequence of closed-ended questions was asked early in the interview for a random half of respondents and late in the interview for the other half, was included as part of the mode comparison experiment described below. For both of these features, the relevant codebook entries contain explanatory notes. All random selections were programmed into the computer application of the questionnaire and occurred automatically and independently of other circumstances of the interview. CAI eliminates the preparation of a paper and pencil version which would previously have been published in the codebook.

STUDY ADMINISTRATION

Interviewing for the pre-election survey began on September 3, 1996 and concluded on November 4, 1996. The average length of interview in the pre-election survey was 74 minutes. The overall response rate was 71%. (See "Response Rates" below for a complete discussion.) The post-election interviewing occurred between November 6 and December 31, 1996 inclusive, with an average interview length of 70 minutes. The overall reinterview rate was 90%, with further details available in the Response Rate section below.

Sample "Releases" in the Pre-election survey
Both parts of the sample (panel and cross-section) were randomly subdivided into four quarter sample releases, each of which is a proper, random subsample of the NES sample. Two additional 'reserve' replicates of cross-section cases were held in abeyance until it was determined that the additional sample lines would be needed to attain study goals. Replicates 1 through 4 were considered the "base sample," certain to be released. The release dates for sample replicates were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Replicate</th>
<th>Date of release</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>September 3, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>September 12, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>September 26, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>October 10, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (Reserve)</td>
<td>September 26, 1996 (with replicate 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (Reserve)</td>
<td>October 10, 1996 (with replicate 4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For a full description of the sample design and implementation, see "1996 SAMPLE DESIGN".

Pre-election study: assignment to telephone mode

One of the administrative problems in fielding a panel study is that respondents have had an intervening period of time in which to relocate, perhaps at some remove from areas where field study staff are available to interview them. We estimated that between 40 and 80 respondents might have moved to areas in which SRC did not have interviewers in the field. Our priority was to interview as many panel respondents as possible, but we did not want to incur the additional costs associated with interviewer travel. Accordingly, panel respondents who had moved 'out-of-range' for a face-to-face interview were converted to phone mode. The criterion set for deciding if a case was 'out-of-range' was 90 minutes driving time one-way from the interviewer's home to the respondent's address under local usual driving conditions. The total number of panel respondents that we interviewed who were "out of range" for this reason was 47.

Post-Election Mode Experiment: Design and Implementation

In contrast with the usual NES practice of conducting all post-election interviews in person, half of the respondents in the post-election wave of the 1996 survey were interviewed by telephone, with post-election respondents randomly assigned (except in extreme circumstances) to phone or face-to-face administration. The telephone mode used the same computerized questionnaire developed for the face-to-face post-election interviews and was conducted by the same interviewers. The mode experiment provides a direct comparison of the effects of mode of interview on important indicators of data quality and comparability.

Cases were assigned to either telephone or face-to-face mode at the sample segment level. Every effort to retain randomly assigned cases in their assigned mode was made. Respondents who had been interviewed by telephone in the pre-election study were disqualified from random assignment to mode; all those reinterviews were done by telephone, a total of 47 cases. Respondents who did not have telephones and respondents who were not able to participate in the mode experiment because of a physical limitation that prevented them from being interviewed by one mode or another were also excluded, which totaled 130 additional cases (24 of these were completed by telephone). No changes in mode of interview because of respondent preference or for ease of administration were permitted.
All prospective respondents received two incentives in the mail: a check for $10 and a small gift. Included in the mailing to telephone mode respondents was a sealed respondent booklet with the candidate ballot folded inside. The contact letter instructed respondents to set these materials aside until told to open them by the interviewer. Interviewers followed procedures to ascertain that respondents were using the booklet and ballot card appropriately and to note deviations from the instructions.

Evaluation of problems in study implementation

Two implementation problems arose in the post-election field administration. This resulted in two unintended systematic deviations from standard administration. 145 cases in the phone mode were mailed a respondent booklet that included the wrong ballot card. As soon as this problem was discovered, new respondent booklets with correct ballot cards were mailed by overnight mail to these respondents. Approximately 50 interviews were conducted where the respondent had the incorrect ballot card; in these cases interviewers read the correct ballot card information to the respondent. A full report to be issued will analyze these data to identify any systematic differences related to this implementation error. It was discovered early in the data collection period that 39 interviews were completed using the training version of the survey instrument, due to a technical problem in transmitting files to the field. The training version contained no randomized presentation of questions and lacked several last minute changes to the interview. Call-backs to 37 of these 39 respondents allowed us to collect data on the several missed questions. A report analyzing these cases for differential impact of the use of the training questionnaire is in preparation.

RESPONSE RATES

The response rate in the pre-election study was 71%. Among panel respondents the response (reinterview) rate was 76%; among cross-section respondents it was 60%.

The overall reinterview/response rate in the post-election interviewing was 90%. Among panel respondents in the post-election survey, the response rate was 91% and among cross-section respondents it was 85%. The response rate in face-to-face mode (including all cases in this mode, experimentally assigned and excluded) was 89% and for telephone mode it was 91%.

INTERVIEW COMPLETION RATE

Completion rates for the pre-election sample releases, for pre-election time periods, and for post-election time periods are presented here. Table 1 presents the percentage completions per quarter sample replicate (replicates 3 and 4 include the reserve cases added to those replicates); table 2 shows the percentage of completions per two week time period in the pre-election survey. Table 3 lays out the number of interviews taken for each week elapsing after the Nov. 5 General Election. In 1996, 29% of the interviews were completed in the first week after the election and 86% in the first three weeks; progress was evenly divided between face-to-face and telephone modes.

Table 1: % Completions by release (pre-election survey)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELEASE</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Panel</th>
<th>Cross-section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Percent Completions by two week period (pre-election survey)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATES</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Panel</th>
<th>Cross-section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/3-9/16</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17-10/1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2-10/16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/17-10/30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31-11/4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Number of and Cumulative Percent of Interviews Taken in the Post-Election Study by Week of Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATES</th>
<th>NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENT OF INTERVIEWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 6-Nov.12</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov.13-Nov.19</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov.20-Nov.26</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>1314</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov.27-Dec. 3</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1405</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec.4- Dec. 10</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec.11-Dec.17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1521</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec.18-Dec.24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec.25-Dec.31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1534</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FILE STRUCTURE

The AMERICAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY, 1996 PRE- AND POST-ELECTION SURVEY are available in logical record length (LRECL) format. The data are sorted in ascending order by respondent number, and contain 1,657 variables for 1714 respondents.

The machine-readable codebook, which provides complete formatting and other information for all variables accompanies the data. In addition, a set of SAS and SPSS control statements has been prepared for this collection. The control statements contain formatting information as well as variable labels, value labels and missing data specifications for all variables in the collection.

The data can also be accessed directly through software packages that do not use SAS or SPSS control statements by specifying the record locations of the desired variables. The record locations for all variables are provided in the codebook.

NOTES ON CONFIDENTIALITY

Starting with the 1986 Election Study, NES has released occupation code variables in somewhat less detail than in years past. This dataset includes a two-digit code with 71 categories corresponding to Census Bureau occupational groupings. Those who need the full occupation code for their research should contact the NES project staff for information about the conditions under which access may be provided. Similarly, the National Election Studies have not included information for census tracts or minor civil divisions since 1978. Permission to use the more detailed geographic information for scholarly research may be obtained from the Board of Overseers. More information about...
this is available from NES project staff. Coding of the new religious denomination variable is in some cases based on an alphabetic "other, please specify" variable. This variable is restricted for reasons of confidentiality, but access may be provided to legitimate scholars under established NES procedures.

OPEN-ENDED MATERIALS

Traditionally, the National Election Studies have contained several minutes of open-ended responses (for example, the candidate likes and dislikes). These questions are put into Master Codes by the SRC coding section. Other scholars have developed alternative or supplemental coding schemes for the questions (for example, the levels of conceptualization, released as ICPSR 8151). The Board of Overseers wishes to encourage these efforts but in ways which respect the NES and SRC obligation to protect the privacy and anonymity of respondents. Circumstances under which individuals may have access to transcribed versions of these questions have been worked out and those interested should contact the NES project staff for further details.

1996 SPECIAL NOTE - CHANGES IN CODING BETWEEN PRE AND POST

Several questions which were asked in the Pre-election interview and then asked again in the Post-Election interview had some differences between the versions used.

Variables where pre and post codes (and some code labels) don't match on repeated questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>960369</td>
<td>1273</td>
<td>(Code 4 label; Respon. Booklet identical both waves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960370</td>
<td>1274</td>
<td>(Code 4 label; Respon. Booklet identical both waves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960371</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>(Code 4 label; Respon. Booklet identical both waves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960375</td>
<td>1277</td>
<td>(Code 4 label; Respon. Booklet identical both waves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960376</td>
<td>1278</td>
<td>(Code 4 label; Respon. Booklet identical both waves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960377</td>
<td>1279</td>
<td>(Code 4 label; Respon. Booklet identical both waves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960378</td>
<td>1280</td>
<td>(Code 4 label; Respon. Booklet identical both waves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960566</td>
<td>1251</td>
<td>(Code 7 in Pre; code 4 in Post)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960569</td>
<td>1259</td>
<td>(Codes 1, 2 in Pre; codes 1, 5 in Post)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For variables 960369-371, 960375-378 / 961273-1275, 961277-1280 (7 point liberal-conservative scale questions) the differences appeared onscreen to the interviewer but the labeled Respondent Booklet was accurate (complete code 4 label) and identical for both interviews.

NEW WEIGHTS FOR THE 1996 STUDY  (RELEASED MARCH 1998)

The steps taken to address the 1996 NES overestimation of voting in the 1996 presidential election resulted in the development of post-stratified weights which account for individual selection probability, regional differences in household nonresponse, and misrepresentation of any age by education subgroups. These revised, CPS-standardized weights were computed for the 1994 NES Post and 1996 NES Pre and Post Election data sets. Users of previous weights released with the 1994 and 1996 data will find that these weights extend and combine the features of previously released weights. Similar weights were computed for the 1992 cross-section cases; these weights will be included in an upcoming combined 1992-1994-1996 data file.

V960005A and V960005B, the two new weight variables for 1996, are released for the first time for use with the 1996 NES data. A review of the findings that
led to the construction of these new weights and full details of their development and effect are described in new Appendix B, "Post-Stratified Cross-sectional Analysis Weights for the 1992, 1994 and 1996 NES Data." The recommendation to explore developing these weights was made by Warren Miller and Merrill Shanks and authorized by the NES Board of Overseers at its September 1997 meeting. The SRC Sampling Section, under the direction of Steve Heeringa, completed the work and the technical report in consultation with the NES Director of Studies.

There are two weights, one to be applied to the pre-election sample (V960005A) and the other which is for use with the post-election sample (V960005B). The post-election sample weight takes into account attrition that occurred between the pre- and post-election surveys. In analyses using variables from both the pre- and post-election data, the post-election weight should be applied. Use of either weight is appropriate only for the full sample, cross-section and panel cases combined.

>> Study Design, Content, and Administration 1997 PILOT

Study Design

The 1997 Pilot Study was conducted between September 5 and October 1, 1997. The study is a reinterview of a subset of respondents with telephones from the 1996 Post-Election Study. All fresh-cross section cases for 1996 that completed a post-election interview and for which telephone numbers were available were included in the 1997 pilot. The balance of cases consisted of cases from the two previous waves, the 1994 'panel' cases and the 1992 'panel' cases for which telephone numbers were available and a post-election interview was conducted in 1996. Each of these panel components was represented proportionally in the initial sample for 1997. The initial sample consisted of 724 respondents from 1996; 551 of these respondents completed an interview in 1997.

The response rate is thus .76 (551/724). The number of refusals was 22. The remainder of the non-interviews are persons with whom contact was never made, or who were unavailable during the study period, for such reasons as illness or absence from home.

The study mode was Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing ("CATI"). The average interview length was 45.3 minutes.

Study Content

The content of the study reflects the NES commitment to improve measures of group mobilization, interest articulation and representation, group-based political reasoning, race and racial attitudes and policy, issue attitudes, human and social capital, social choice, theories of the survey response, and other responses to a stimulus letter calling for ideas for content sent to the user community on November 11, 1996.

Specific topic areas in the study include:

MOBILIZATION AND NON ELECTORAL PARTICIPATION:

A battery designed to improve NES instrumentation on non-electoral political participation and mobilization; specifically, respondents' efforts to contact public officials at different levels of government during the non electoral season and their reasons for contact.
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GROUP-BASED POLITICS:

Elaborated testing of long-standing NES instrumentation on group closeness designed to evaluate both "traditional" NES instrumentation and investigate possible additions and improvements.

Group difference and group conflict as a basis of current mass politics: Perceptions of paired "opposing" social groups on issue, ideology, party placements and vote choice. The groups include black and white people, Christian fundamentalists and gays and lesbians, and men and women. There is an embedded experiment testing the effects of focusing on group difference and conflict on social trust and political trust and interest.

Group threat as a basis of group-based politics: A split ballot of items involving an experimental manipulation of the level of threat in different domains and prejudices about Blacks and Christian Fundamentalists.

RESPONSE LATENCY:

Activated timings of response latencies on several questions to extend recent NES work on certainty.

EVALUATIONS OF THE PRESIDENT, CONGRESS AND THE SUPREME COURT:

Exploration of a new battery of items to improve current NES instrumentation and extend parallel measurement across governmental institutions.

RELIGION AND POLITICS:

Further Pilot work on the role of religion in citizens' political thinking; attitudes toward the role of religion and religious institutions in American society and politics.

The use of CATI enabled a number of experimental treatments within the survey instrument. Random assignment to question wording, early-late placement and presentation order were applied to numerous question sequences. Rosters of items, such as the thermometer and placements of groups and individuals on scales, were randomized in administration, to minimize order effects. Indicator variables that document the use of split-ballot and randomization features are found in the codebook.

Data and Documentation

Because the 551 Pilot Study respondents had also been interviewed in the 1996 Pre- and Post Election Studies, their data from those studies has been merged onto the datafile. There are 551 cases in the dataset (in other words, it contains 1996 data only for those respondents who were reinterviewed in 1997).

The dataset is an ASCII, or "raw" dataset, accompanied by SAS and SPSS control cards. Missing data definition cards are also included.

Documentation for the 1997 Pilot Study is available as an ASCII text file on the NES website (http://www.umich.edu/~nes) and from the ICPSR (http://www.icpsr.umich.edu). 1996 Election Studies documentation is also available (separately) on both websites; it is not included as part of the 1997 Pilot Study release.
Please also see related paragraphs in the Introductory section of the codebook for general information about the 'Groups' section in the Post.

For data users interested in a greater level of detail for the Post 'Groups' section (R3-R7w), the raw data for the 1996 Study includes additional data which are not represented in the codebook and are not included in the SAS and SPSS data definition files provided with the Study data. To access these additional variables, the column numbers may be cut and pasted from the listings below and then inserted into the SAS or SPSS data definition file that the user is submitting. SAS and SPSS missing data assignments also may be cut and pasted into the user's file. This additional information provides the specific responses to questions about individual groups in each category--Group1, Group2, Group3 or Group4.

GROUP SPECIFIC DATA

For the question on group membership, the category summary variable identifies the specific groups of which R is a member and additional group-specific vars are not necessary.

For the questions on dues/contributions, meetings/activities, and political discussion, however, more than 2 responses were possible and the summary variables could not identify the particular response for an individual group.

The responses categories are:

"In the past 12 months have you paid dues or given any money to this group? Which is that? (Dues, contributions, or both?)"
1. Dues
3. Contributions
5. Both
7. Other (specify)
8. DK
9. NA
0. Inap, R is not involved with any group in this category; no further group mentioned in this category (Groups 2-4 only); no post IW

"In the last 12 months have you taken part in any activities sponsored by this group or attended a meeting of this group?"
1. Attended a meeting
3. Taken part in activities
5. Both
8. DK
9. NA
0. Inap, R is not involved with any groups in this category; no further group mentioned in this category (Groups 2-4 only); no post IW

"How often does this group discuss politics-- often, sometimes, rarely, or never?"
1. Often
2. Sometimes
3. Rarely
4. Never
8. DK
9. NA
0. Inap, R is not involved with any groups in this category; no further group mentioned in this category (Groups 2-4 only); no post IW
COMPLETE SET OF COLUMN LOCATIONS
(Within each group category, Group 1 is identified in the "A" variable, Group 2 in the "B" variable, Group 3 in the "C" variable, and Group 4 in the "D" variable). SEE MISSING DATA HEADINGS BELOW TO IDENTIFY QUESTIONS WITHIN GROUP CATEGORIES.

V961344 5756
V961345 5757-5760
V961346 5761-5764
V961346A 5765
V961346B 5766
V961346C 5767
V961346D 5768
V961347 5769-5772
V961347A 5773
V961347B 5774
V961347C 5775
V961347D 5776
V961348 5777-5780
V961348A 5781
V961348B 5782
V961348C 5783
V961348D 5784
V961349 5785
V961350 5786-5789
V961351 5790-5793
V961351A 5794
V961351B 5795
V961351C 5796
V961351D 5797
V961352 5798-5801
V961352A 5802
V961352B 5803
V961352C 5804
V961352D 5805
V961353 5806-5809
V961353A 5810
V961353B 5811
V961353C 5812
V961353D 5813
V961354 5814
V961355 5815-5818
V961356 5819-5822
V961356A 5823
V961356B 5824
V961356C 5825
V961356D 5826
V961357 5827-5830
V961357A 5831
V961357B 5832
V961357C 5833
V961357D 5834
V961358 5835-5838
V961358A 5839
V961358B 5840
V961358C 5841
V961358D 5842
V961359 5843
GROUP-SPECIFIC MISSING DATA

*********************************************************************
*********************************************************************

FOR PAYMENT OF DUES/CONTRIBUTIONS:
the group-specific data may be found in the columns below. For each group
category, the first variable corresponds to the response for Group1 mention,
the second variable corresponds to the response for Group2 mention, etc.

LABOR UNIONS DUES/CONTRIBUTIONS
if v961346a =0 then v961346a =.;
if v961346b =0 then v961346b =.;
if v961346c =0 then v961346c =.;
if v961346d =0 then v961346d =.;
v961346a (0)
v961346b (0)
v961346c (0)
v961346d (0)

BUSINESS OR WORK-RELATED DUES/CONTRIBUTIONS
if v961351a =0 then v961351a =.;
if v961351b =0 then v961351b =.;
if v961351c =0 then v961351c =.;
if v961351d =0 then v961351d =.;
v961351a (0)
v961351b (0)
v961351c (0)
v961351d (0)
VETERANS DUES/CONTRIBUTIONS
if v961356a =0 then v961356a =.;
if v961356b =0 then v961356b =.;
if v961356c =0 then v961356c =.;
if v961356d =0 then v961356d =.;
v961356a (0)
v961356b (0)
v961356c (0)
v961356d (0)

CHURCH/SYNAGOGUE DUES/CONTRIBUTIONS
if v961361a =0 then v961361a =.;
if v961361b =0 then v961361b =.;
if v961361c =0 then v961361c =.;
if v961361d =0 then v961361d =.;
v961361a (0)
v961361b (0)
v961361c (0)
v961361d (0)

OTHER RELIGIOUS DUES/CONTRIBUTIONS
if v961366a =0 then v961366a =.;
if v961366b =0 then v961366b =.;
if v961366c =0 then v961366c =.;
if v961366d =0 then v961366d =.;
v961366a (0)
v961366b (0)
v961366c (0)
v961366d (0)

ELDERLY/SENIOR DUES/CONTRIBUTIONS
if v961371a =0 then v961371a =.;
if v961371b =0 then v961371b =.;
if v961371c =0 then v961371c =.;
if v961371d =0 then v961371d =.;
v961371a (0)
v961371b (0)
v961371c (0)
v961371d (0)

ETHNIC/NATIONALITY DUES/CONTRIBUTIONS
if v961376a =0 then v961376a =.;
if v961376b =0 then v961376b =.;
if v961376c =0 then v961376c =.;
if v961376d =0 then v961376d =.;
v961376a (0)
v961376b (0)
v961376c (0)
v961376d (0)

WOMEN'S RIGHTS OR WELFARE DUES/CONTRIBUTIONS
if v961381a =0 then v961381a =.;
if v961381b =0 then v961381b =.;
if v961381c =0 then v961381c =.;
if v961381d =0 then v961381d =.;
v961381a (0)
v961381b (0)
v961381c (0)
v961381d (0)
POLITICAL ISSUE DUES/CONTRIBUTIONS
if v961386a =0 then  v961386a =.;
if v961386b =0 then  v961386b =.;
if v961386c =0 then  v961386c =.;
if v961386d =0 then  v961386d =.;
v961386a (0)
v961386b (0)
v961386c (0)
v961386d (0)

NONPARTISAN OR CIVIC DUES/CONTRIBUTIONS
if v961391a =0 then  v961391a =.;
if v961391b =0 then  v961391b =.;
if v961391c =0 then  v961391c =.;
if v961391d =0 then  v961391d =.;
v961391a (0)
v961391b (0)
v961391c (0)
v961391d (0)

LIBERAL OR CONSERVATIVE DUES/CONTRIBUTIONS
if v961396a =0 then  v961396a =.;
if v961396b =0 then  v961396b =.;
if v961396c =0 then  v961396c =.;
if v961396d =0 then  v961396d =.;
v961396a (0)
v961396b (0)
v961396c (0)
v961396d (0)

POLITICAL PARTY OR CAND SUPPORT DUES/CONTRIBUTIONS
if v961401a =0 then  v961401a =.;
if v961401b =0 then  v961401b =.;
if v961401c =0 then  v961401c =.;
if v961401d =0 then  v961401d =.;
v961401a (0)
v961401b (0)
v961401c (0)
v961401d (0)

CHILDRENS' ACTIVITY DUES/CONTRIBUTIONS
if v961406a =0 then  v961406a =.;
if v961406b =0 then  v961406b =.;
if v961406c =0 then  v961406c =.;
if v961406d =0 then  v961406d =.;
v961406a (0)
v961406b (0)
v961406c (0)
v961406d (0)

LITERARY, ART OR DISCUSSION DUES/CONTRIBUTIONS
if v961411a =0 then  v961411a =.;
if v961411b =0 then  v961411b =.;
if v961411c =0 then  v961411c =.;
if v961411d =0 then  v961411d =.;
v961411a (0)
v961411b (0)
v961411c (0)
v961411d (0)

HOBBY OR LEISURE DUES/CONTRIBUTIONS
if v961416a =0 then v961416a =.;
if v961416b =0 then v961416b =.;
if v961416c =0 then v961416c =.;
if v961416d =0 then v961416d =.;
v961416a (0)
v961416b (0)
v961416c (0)
v961416d (0)

NEIGHBORHOOD OR COMMUNITY DUES/CONTRIBUTIONS
if v961421a =0 then v961421a =.;
if v961421b =0 then v961421b =.;
if v961421c =0 then v961421c =.;
if v961421d =0 then v961421d =.;
v961421a (0)
v961421b (0)
v961421c (0)
v961421d (0)

SERVICE/FRATERNAL DUES/CONTRIBUTIONS
if v961426a =0 then v961426a =.;
if v961426b =0 then v961426b =.;
if v961426c =0 then v961426c =.;
if v961426d =0 then v961426d =.;
v961426a (0)
v961426b (0)
v961426c (0)
v961426d (0)

SERVICE TO NEEDY DUES/CONTRIBUTIONS
if v961431a =0 then v961431a =.;
if v961431b =0 then v961431b =.;
if v961431c =0 then v961431c =.;
if v961431d =0 then v961431d =.;
v961431a (0)
v961431b (0)
v961431c (0)
v961431d (0)

EDUCATIONAL DUES/CONTRIBUTIONS
if v961436a =0 then v961436a =.;
if v961436b =0 then v961436b =.;
if v961436c =0 then v961436c =.;
if v961436d =0 then v961436d =.;
v961436a (0)
v961436b (0)
v961436c (0)
v961436d (0)

CULTURAL SERVICE DUES/CONTRIBUTIONS
if v961441a =0 then v961441a =.;
if v961441b =0 then v961441b =.;
if v961441c =0 then v961441c =.;
if v961441d =0 then v961441d =.;
v961441a (0)
v961441b (0)
SELF-HELP DUES/CONTRIBUTIONS
if v961446a =0 then v961446a =.;
if v961446b =0 then v961446b =.;
if v961446c =0 then v961446c =.;
if v961446d =0 then v961446d =.;
v961446a (0)
v961446b (0)
v961446c (0)
v961446d (0)

OTHER DUES/CONTRIBUTIONS
if v961451a =0 then v961451a =.;
if v961451b =0 then v961451b =.;
if v961451c =0 then v961451c =.;
if v961451d =0 then v961451d =.;
v961451a (0)
v961451b (0)
v961451c (0)
v961451d (0)

FOR MEETINGS/ACTIVITIES:
the group-specific data may be found in the columns below. For each group
category, the first variable corresponds to the response for Group1 mention,
the second variable corresponds to the response for Group2 mention, etc.

LABOR UNIONS MEETINGS/ACTIVITIES
if v961347a =0 then v961347a =.;
if v961347b =0 then v961347b =.;
if v961347c =0 then v961347c =.;
if v961347d =0 then v961347d =.;
v961347a (0)
v961347b (0)
v961347c (0)
v961347d (0)

BUSINESS OR WORK-RELATED MEETINGS/ACTIVITIES
if v961352a =0 then v961352a =.;
if v961352b =0 then v961352b =.;
if v961352c =0 then v961352c =.;
if v961352d =0 then v961352d =.;
v961352a (0)
v961352b (0)
v961352c (0)
v961352d (0)

VETERANS MEETINGS/ACTIVITIES
if v961357a =0 then v961357a =.;
if v961357b =0 then v961357b =.;
if v961357c =0 then v961357c =.;
if v961357d =0 then v961357d =.;
v961357a (0)
v961357b (0)
v961357c (0)
v961357d (0)
CHURCH/SYNAGOGUE MEETINGS/ACTIVITIES
if v961362a =0 then v961362a =.;
if v961362b =0 then v961362b =.;
if v961362c =0 then v961362c =.;
if v961362d =0 then v961362d =.;
v961362a (0)
v961362b (0)
v961362c (0)
v961362d (0)

OTHER RELIGIOUS MEETINGS/ACTIVITIES
if v961367a =0 then v961367a =.;
if v961367b =0 then v961367b =.;
if v961367c =0 then v961367c =.;
if v961367d =0 then v961367d =.;
v961367a (0)
v961367b (0)
v961367c (0)
v961367d (0)

ELDERLY/SENIOR MEETINGS/ACTIVITIES
if v961372a =0 then v961372a =.;
if v961372b =0 then v961372b =.;
if v961372c =0 then v961372c =.;
if v961372d =0 then v961372d =.;
v961372a (0)
v961372b (0)
v961372c (0)
v961372d (0)

ETHNIC/NATIONALITY MEETINGS/ACTIVITIES
if v961377a =0 then v961377a =.;
if v961377b =0 then v961377b =.;
if v961377c =0 then v961377c =.;
if v961377d =0 then v961377d =.;
v961377a (0)
v961377b (0)
v961377c (0)
v961377d (0)

WOMEN'S RIGHTS OR WELFARE MEETINGS/ACTIVITIES
if v961382a =0 then v961382a =.;
if v961382b =0 then v961382b =.;
if v961382c =0 then v961382c =.;
if v961382d =0 then v961382d =.;
v961382a (0)
v961382b (0)
v961382c (0)
v961382d (0)

POLITICAL ISSUE MEETINGS/ACTIVITIES
if v961387a =0 then v961387a =.;
if v961387b =0 then v961387b =.;
if v961387c =0 then v961387c =.;
if v961387d =0 then v961387d =.;
v961387a (0)
v961387b (0)
v961387c (0)
v961387d (0)

NONPARTISAN OR CIVIC MEETINGS/ACTIVITIES
if v961392a =0 then v961392a =.;
if v961392b =0 then v961392b =.;
if v961392c =0 then v961392c =.;
if v961392d =0 then v961392d =.;
v961392a (0)
v961392b (0)
v961392c (0)
v961392d (0)

LIBERAL OR CONSERVATIVE MEETINGS/ACTIVITIES
if v961397a =0 then v961397a =.;
if v961397b =0 then v961397b =.;
if v961397c =0 then v961397c =.;
if v961397d =0 then v961397d =.;
v961397a (0)
v961397b (0)
v961397c (0)
v961397d (0)

POLITICAL PARTY OR CAND SUPPORT MEETINGS/ACTIVITIES
if v961402a =0 then v961402a =.;
if v961402b =0 then v961402b =.;
if v961402c =0 then v961402c =.;
if v961402d =0 then v961402d =.;
v961402a (0)
v961402b (0)
v961402c (0)
v961402d (0)

CHILDRENS' ACTIVITY MEETINGS/ACTIVITIES
if v961407a =0 then v961407a =.;
if v961407b =0 then v961407b =.;
if v961407c =0 then v961407c =.;
if v961407d =0 then v961407d =.;
v961407a (0)
v961407b (0)
v961407c (0)
v961407d (0)

LITERARY, ART OR DISCUSSION MEETINGS/ACTIVITIES
if v961412a =0 then v961412a =.;
if v961412b =0 then v961412b =.;
if v961412c =0 then v961412c =.;
if v961412d =0 then v961412d =.;
v961412a (0)
v961412b (0)
v961412c (0)
v961412d (0)

HOBBY OR LEISURE MEETINGS/ACTIVITIES
if v961417a =0 then v961417a =.;
if v961417b =0 then v961417b =.;
if v961417c =0 then v961417c =.;
if v961417d =0 then v961417d =.;
v961417a (0)
v961417b (0)
v961417c (0)
v961417d (0)

NEIGHBORHOOD OR COMMUNITY MEETINGS/ACTIVITIES
if v961422a =0 then v961422a =.;
if v961422b =0 then v961422b =.;
if v961422c =0 then v961422c =.;
if v961422d =0 then v961422d =.;
v961422a (0)
v961422b (0)
v961422c (0)
v961422d (0)

SERVICE/FRATERNAL MEETINGS/ACTIVITIES
if v961427a =0 then v961427a =.;
if v961427b =0 then v961427b =.;
if v961427c =0 then v961427c =.;
if v961427d =0 then v961427d =.;
v961427a (0)
v961427b (0)
v961427c (0)
v961427d (0)

SERVICE TO NEEDY MEETINGS/ACTIVITIES
if v961432a =0 then v961432a =.;
if v961432b =0 then v961432b =.;
if v961432c =0 then v961432c =.;
if v961432d =0 then v961432d =.;
v961432a (0)
v961432b (0)
v961432c (0)
v961432d (0)

EDUCATIONAL MEETINGS/ACTIVITIES
if v961437a =0 then v961437a =.;
if v961437b =0 then v961437b =.;
if v961437c =0 then v961437c =.;
if v961437d =0 then v961437d =.;
v961437a (0)
v961437b (0)
v961437c (0)
v961437d (0)

CULTURAL SERVICE MEETINGS/ACTIVITIES
if v961442a =0 then v961442a =.;
if v961442b =0 then v961442b =.;
if v961442c =0 then v961442c =.;
if v961442d =0 then v961442d =.;
v961442a (0)
v961442b (0)
v961442c (0)
v961442d (0)

SELF-HELP MEETINGS/ACTIVITIES
if v961447a =0 then v961447a =.;
if v961447b =0 then v961447b =.;
if v961447c =0 then v961447c =.;
if v961447d =0 then v961447d =.;
v961447a (0)
v961447b (0)
v961447c (0)
v961447d (0)

OTHER MEETINGS/ACTIVITIES
if v961452a =0 then  v961452a =.;
if v961452b =0 then  v961452b =.;
if v961452c =0 then  v961452c =.;
if v961452d =0 then  v961452d =.;
v961452a (0)
v961452b (0)
v961452c (0)
v961452d (0)

************************************************************
************************************************************
FOR POLITICAL DISCUSSION:
the group-specific data may be found in the columns below. For each group
category, the first variable corresponds to the response for Group1 mention,
the second variable corresponds to the response for Group2 mention, etc.

LABOR UNIONS POLITICAL DISCUSSION
if v961348a =0 then  v961348a =.;
if v961348b =0 then  v961348b =.;
if v961348c =0 then  v961348c =.;
if v961348d =0 then  v961348d =.;
v961348a (0)
v961348b (0)
v961348c (0)
v961348d (0)

BUSINESS OR WORK-RELATED POLITICAL DISCUSSION
if v961353a =0 then  v961353a =.;
if v961353b =0 then  v961353b =.;
if v961353c =0 then  v961353c =.;
if v961353d =0 then  v961353d =.;
v961353a (0)
v961353b (0)
v961353c (0)
v961353d (0)

VETERANS POLITICAL DISCUSSION
if v961358a =0 then  v961358a =.;
if v961358b =0 then  v961358b =.;
if v961358c =0 then  v961358c =.;
if v961358d =0 then  v961358d =.;
v961358a (0)
v961358b (0)
v961358c (0)
v961358d (0)

CHURCH/SYNAGOGUE POLITICAL DISCUSSION
if v961363a =0 then  v961363a =.;
if v961363b =0 then  v961363b =.;
if v961363c =0 then  v961363c =.;
if v961363d =0 then  v961363d =.;
v961363a (0)
v961363b (0)
v961363c (0)
OTHER RELIGIOUS POLITICAL DISCUSSION
if v961368a =0 then v961368a =.;
if v961368b =0 then v961368b =.;
if v961368c =0 then v961368c =.;
if v961368d =0 then v961368d =.;
v961368a (0)
v961368b (0)
v961368c (0)
v961368d (0)

ELDERLY/SENIOR POLITICAL DISCUSSION
if v961373a =0 then v961373a =.;
if v961373b =0 then v961373b =.;
if v961373c =0 then v961373c =.;
if v961373d =0 then v961373d =.;
v961373a (0)
v961373b (0)
v961373c (0)
v961373d (0)

ETHNIC/NATIONALITY POLITICAL DISCUSSION
if v961378a =0 then v961378a =.;
if v961378b =0 then v961378b =.;
if v961378c =0 then v961378c =.;
if v961378d =0 then v961378d =.;
v961378a (0)
v961378b (0)
v961378c (0)
v961378d (0)

WOMEN'S RIGHTS OR WELFARE POLITICAL DISCUSSION
if v961383a =0 then v961383a =.;
if v961383b =0 then v961383b =.;
if v961383c =0 then v961383c =.;
if v961383d =0 then v961383d =.;
v961383a (0)
v961383b (0)
v961383c (0)
v961383d (0)

POLITICAL ISSUE POLITICAL DISCUSSION
if v961388a =0 then v961388a =.;
if v961388b =0 then v961388b =.;
if v961388c =0 then v961388c =.;
if v961388d =0 then v961388d =.;
v961388a (0)
v961388b (0)
v961388c (0)
v961388d (0)

NONPARTISAN OR CIV96IC
if v961393a =0 then v961393a =.;
if v961393b =0 then v961393b =.;
if v961393c =0 then v961393c =.;
if v961393d =0 then v961393d =.;
v961393a (0)
v961393b (0)
LIBERAL OR CONSERVATIVE POLITICAL DISCUSSION
if v961398a =0 then v961398a =.;
if v961398b =0 then v961398b =.;
if v961398c =0 then v961398c =.;
if v961398d =0 then v961398d =.;
v961398a (0)
v961398b (0)
v961398c (0)
v961398d (0)

POLITICAL PARTY OR CAND SUPPORT POLITICAL DISCUSSION
if v961403a =0 then v961403a =.;
if v961403b =0 then v961403b =.;
if v961403c =0 then v961403c =.;
if v961403d =0 then v961403d =.;
v961403a (0)
v961403b (0)
v961403c (0)
v961403d (0)

CHILDRENS' ACTIVITY POLITICAL DISCUSSION
if v961408a =0 then v961408a =.;
if v961408b =0 then v961408b =.;
if v961408c =0 then v961408c =.;
if v961408d =0 then v961408d =.;
v961408a (0)
v961408b (0)
v961408c (0)
v961408d (0)

LITERARY, ART OR DISCUSSION POLITICAL DISCUSSION
if v961413a =0 then v961413a =.;
if v961413b =0 then v961413b =.;
if v961413c =0 then v961413c =.;
if v961413d =0 then v961413d =.;
v961413a (0)
v961413b (0)
v961413c (0)
v961413d (0)

HOBBY OR LEISURE POLITICAL DISCUSSION
if v961418a =0 then v961418a =.;
if v961418b =0 then v961418b =.;
if v961418c =0 then v961418c =.;
if v961418d =0 then v961418d =.;
v961418a (0)
v961418b (0)
v961418c (0)
v961418d (0)

NEIGHBORHOOD OR COMMUNITY POLITICAL DISCUSSION
if v961423a =0 then v961423a =.;
if v961423b =0 then v961423b =.;
if v961423c =0 then v961423c =.;
if v961423d =0 then v961423d =.;
v961423a (0)
SERVICE/FRATERNAL POLITICAL DISCUSSION
if v961428a =0 then v961428a =.;
if v961428b =0 then v961428b =.;
if v961428c =0 then v961428c =.;
if v961428d =0 then v961428d =.;
v961428a (0)
v961428b (0)
v961428c (0)
v961428d (0)

SERVICE TO NEEDY POLITICAL DISCUSSION
if v961433a =0 then v961433a =.;
if v961433b =0 then v961433b =.;
if v961433c =0 then v961433c =.;
if v961433d =0 then v961433d =.;
v961433a (0)
v961433b (0)
v961433c (0)
v961433d (0)

EDUCATIONAL POLITICAL DISCUSSION
if v961438a =0 then v961438a =.;
if v961438b =0 then v961438b =.;
if v961438c =0 then v961438c =.;
if v961438d =0 then v961438d =.;
v961438a (0)
v961438b (0)
v961438c (0)
v961438d (0)

CULTURAL SERVICE POLITICAL DISCUSSION
if v961443a =0 then v961443a =.;
if v961443b =0 then v961443b =.;
if v961443c =0 then v961443c =.;
if v961443d =0 then v961443d =.;
v961443a (0)
v961443b (0)
v961443c (0)
v961443d (0)

SELF-HELP POLITICAL DISCUSSION
if v961448a =0 then v961448a =.;
if v961448b =0 then v961448b =.;
if v961448c =0 then v961448c =.;
if v961448d =0 then v961448d =.;
v961448a (0)
v961448b (0)
v961448c (0)
v961448d (0)

OTHER POLITICAL DISCUSSION
if v961453a =0 then v961453a =.;
if v961453b =0 then v961453b =.;
if v961453c =0 then v961453c =.;
if v961453d =0 then v961453d =.;
1. Overview: Why is NES issuing new weight variables?

A new set of weights has been constructed for use with the series of National Election Studies beginning with the 1992 Pre-Election Study. This series includes the 1992 Pre and Post, the 1994 Post, and the 1996 Pre and Post Election Studies. The main difference between these and the previously released weights is found in the post-stratification criteria. The new weights post-stratify the National Election Study data to match the Current Population Study (CPS) estimate of the distribution of age group by education level. The previous set of weights adjusted the NES sample to the CPS distribution for Census Region, sex, and age group. These new weights correct for an under-representation of younger and less educated respondents in each year's sample of respondents mainly due to attrition of these categories of respondents in the panel component.

The previous set of analysis weights developed for the 1996 NES public use data sets led to overestimation of reported voter turnout in the 1996 presidential election. A comparison between the 1992 and the 1996 presidential vote turnout estimates from the NES samples does not to reflect the trend of declining participation that has been evident from external sources, such as the Current Population Survey turnout estimates. Several sources of bias caused of this problem, leading to under-representation of 18-22 year olds in the 1996 NES sample, respondents with no high school diploma, or both.

The significance of this under-representation becomes clear when the rates of voting participation by age and education subgroups are examined. The results are summarized in Tables 1a and 1b, below. Table 1a clearly demonstrates the well-known strong relationship between education and voting: people with less education are less likely to vote. Table 1b shows that reported voter turnout is higher among older people. Since the age and education groups with the lowest voting rates are underrepresented, estimates of 1996 presidential election participation are skewed in the direction of higher rates of turnout.

Table 1a:

Reported turnout in the 1996 presidential election by education level of respondent (source: 1996 NES).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>% reporting having voted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1b:

Reported turnout in the 1996 presidential election by age group of the respondent (source: 1996 NES).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>% reporting having voted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-29</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70+</td>
<td>84.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following three sections describe the three major factors which contribute to the under-representation of specific age or education groups. These include "initial contact non-response bias," "coverage bias resulting from longitudinal sample design" and "education related attrition bias." Subsequent sections describe in detail the procedures used in the construction of the new weights.

2. Initial Contact Nonresponse Bias

The first important source of age and education related bias is nonresponse bias at the initial interview. Initial contact nonresponse bias occurs when people with a certain characteristic in common have a significantly different response rate from the overall response rate. For example, if women are found to have a much higher response rate than the combined response rate for men and women, then there is an initial contact nonresponse bias based on gender.

If there were no nonresponse bias based on age or education we would expect the NES cross-section samples to have age by education distributions similar to that of the Current Population Survey (CPS) population estimates. There would be minor differences attributable to sampling error, but we would not expect to find large or systematic differences. Table 2, which compares the weighted distributions of education for the 1992, 1994 and 1996 NES cross-section samples to CPS population estimates for the same years suggests that systematic differences are present.

The weight used in Table 2 is the calculated base weight. This weight is the product of a person-level selection weight and a household-level nonresponse adjustment factor. Since the selection probability
of an eligible adult is inversely proportional to the number of eligible adults in the household it is important to use the selection weight based on the number of eligible adults in the household when comparing NES person-level statistics to CPS person-level distributions. The base weight also adjusts for the difference in response rates by region and by urbanicity. The construction of these weight factors is described in Sections 5 through 8. This part of the NES weight is essentially the same for the old and new weights.

In Table 2, CPS estimates for 1992, 1994 and 1996 are included in the shaded columns. Comparisons of the weighted cross-section data from 1992, 1994 and 1996 to the corresponding CPS estimates reveal clear systematic differences which cannot be wholly attributed to sampling error. In all three cross-section groups there is a strong relationship between the level of education achieved by the respondent and the nonresponse rate. Specifically, people with less education -- especially people without a high school diploma -- tend to be underrepresented in the weighted cross-section samples.

### Table 2: Summary of weighted cross-section distributions by education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td>0.339</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>0.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>0.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>0.236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Coverage Bias Resulting from Longitudinal Sample Design

The longitudinal design of the National Election Study results in a coverage bias in the 1992 and 1994 cross-section component of the 1996 sample. Respondents age 18-19 had no chance of being observed in the panel. Respondents age 20 or 21 years old had a chance of inclusion in only the 1994 cross-section component of the 1996 panel. This structural bias in cross-sectional estimates based on the combined 1996 NES sample is an additional contributor to under-representation of the younger population. The age 18-21 bias in the sample also affects education since the youngest group (e.g., 18-22) has a natural constraint on the level of education that a respondent could have achieved by the time he or she was interviewed.

4. Education Related Attrition Bias

Differential reinterview rates (pre to post as well as across election year waves) based on education also contribute to over-estimation of voting in the 1996 presidential election. The relationship between education and cumulative attrition is shown in...
Tables 3a-3c.

Table 3a tracks the 1992 cross-section cases across subsequent interviews. The age groups listed in the left-most column refer to the respondent's age at the initial interview. Thus, a 29 year old respondent in 1992 would not move into the next higher age group in 1994. Columns labeled "%'" indicate the percent of the original sample that was reinterviewed. For example, in Table 3a, under 1996 (pre), there is a column labeled "n" and a column labeled "%'". The value in the top row in the "%'" column is 71.4%. This means that 71.4 percent of the seven 18-21 year olds with no HS diploma were included in the panel component of the 1996 pre election interview. Sample Tables 3b and 3c show the attrition for the 1994 and 1996 cross-section components.

The summaries of cumulative attrition by education group portray a strong relationship between education and reinterview rate. Respondents with more education are more likely to participate in subsequent interviews. This difference in attrition rate is found between pre and post interviews of the same year (Table 3a - 1992 Post, Table 3c - 1996 Post) as well as across interview years (Table 3b - 1996 Pre). Initially biased samples are subjected to further nonresponse bias at every subsequent interview, causing significant under-representation of less educated, eligible voters. Since eligible adults with low education are less likely to vote and are under-represented in the sample, predictions of voting participation will be biased upward.

Table 3a: Cumulative attrition for the 1992 NES Cross-section sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGE 18-21</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| AGE 22-29    |                   | n    | n | %    | n    | n | %    | n    | n | %    |
| No HS Diploma | 15                | 15    | 100.0 | 8    | 53.3 | 6    | 40.0 | 6    | 40.0 |
| HS Diploma   | 53                | 47    | 88.7 | 29   | 54.7 | 17   | 32.1 | 15   | 28.3 |
| Some College  | 63                | 56    | 88.9 | 44   | 69.8 | 38   | 60.3 | 34   | 54.0 |
| College Graduate | 42           | 38    | 90.5 | 29   | 69.0 | 26   | 61.9 | 23   | 54.8 |
| TOTAL         | 173               | 156   | 90.2 | 110  | 63.6 | 87   | 50.3 | 78   | 45.1 |

| AGE 30-39    |                   | n    | n | %    | n    | n | %    | n    | n | %    |
| No HS        |                   |      |   |      |      |   |      |      |   |      |
|------------------|----------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
|                  | n       | n         | %         | n       | n         |
| No HS Diploma    | 176     | 153       | 86.9      | 108     | 61.4      |
| Diploma          | 23      | 22        | 95.7      | 16      | 47.8      |
| HS Diploma       | 89      | 78        | 87.6      | 56      | 62.9      |
| Some College     | 93      | 86        | 92.5      | 72      | 77.4      |
| College Graduate | 107     | 103       | 96.3      | 78      | 72.9      |
| TOTAL            | 312     | 289       | 92.6      | 222     | 71.2      |

Summary by Education level:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>72.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>71.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>HIGHEST EDUCATION</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-29</td>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>246</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>186</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary by Education Level:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>1994 post</th>
<th>1996 pre</th>
<th>1996 post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>66.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>66.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>76.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1036</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3c: Cumulative attrition for the 1996 NES Cross-section sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE (at 1996)</th>
<th>HIGHEST EDUCATION</th>
<th>1996 (pre)</th>
<th>1996 (post)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-29</td>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>Some College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70+</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>398</td>
<td>337</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary by Education level:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1996 pre</th>
<th>1996 post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Construction of the new weights
The revised NES final analysis weight is based on the product of a calculated base weight and a post-stratification factor. The base weight is constructed to adjust for selection probability and geographic differences in response rates at the time of the initial interview with each sample component. This weight is the product of a selection probability weight and the household nonresponse factor. The base weights for 1992, 1994, and 1996 cross-section cases are initially determined using the corresponding year's household nonresponse factor. Panel cases use this same base weight, carried over from the original interview. Since differences in selection probabilities for the NES sample household are due only to random selection of a single adult from households of various sizes, the selection probability weight is the number of eligible people in the household (up to three).

The post-stratification factor is the ratio of the census proportion for each age by education subgroup, to the corresponding weighted (base weight) sample proportion. Multiplication of the base weight by this post-stratification factor adjusts the weighted sample distribution to conform to the CPS population estimates. The following sections describe the base weight and post-stratification factors in further detail.

Final Weight = base weight x post-stratification factor
where: Base weight = selection weight x household nonresponse factor
and: Selection weight = the number of eligible adults in household (up to three)

6. Construction of a Base Weight

The base weight is the product of two factors: the selection weight and the household nonresponse adjustment factor. Although the National Election Study uses an area probability sample design to achieve an equal probability sample of U.S. households, the NES design does not produce an equal probability sample of persons. Since only one person is chosen from each selected household, any particular individual's probability of selection is inversely proportional to the number of eligible adults in the household. The selection weight which is equal to the number of eligible persons in the household (inverse of the selection probability) adjusts for the under-representation of persons in larger households. The household nonresponse factor is used to adjust for the differential nonresponse rates found in different regions and PSU types (Self-representing MSA, Nonself-representing MSA, and non-MSA. Self-representing MSAs are the largest Metropolitan Statistical Areas in the nation and are therefore self-representing in the 1990 SRC National Sample; Nonself-representing MSAs are medium and smaller sized MSAs, and the non-MSAs are counties which are not designated as MSAs and are less urban.

7. Selection Probability Weight:

The National Election Study uses an area probability sample design to achieve an equal probability sample of U.S. households. If a household has only one eligible adult, that person is included in the sample. If a selected household has more than one eligible adult, one is selected at random. Since the number of eligible adults varies across households, the probability of selection for individuals is unequal and a weight which is the reciprocal of the probability of selection should be used. In the interest of limiting the variation of the weights, respondents selected from households with more than three eligible adults were assigned a weight of three; otherwise the selection weight is equal to the number of eligible adults.

8. Household Nonresponse Adjustment Factor:
Nonresponse bias is a potential source of nonsampling error in the NES data. It has been found that response rates vary significantly by geographic region and PSU type (MSA/non-MSA status). In an effort to counteract this potential source of bias, adjustment factors have been constructed at the household level to account for the geographic and urban/rural differences in response rates. Table 4 shows the initial contact response rates in the 1992, 1994 and 1996 NES by PSU type and region.

The nonresponse adjustment factor was determined by dividing the cross-section cases among twelve cells of four regions (Northeast / Midwest / South /West) by three PSU types (SR MSA, NSR MSA, NSR Non- MSA). The cases in each cell share a nonresponse adjustment factor calculated as the inverse of the response rate of the cell. These response rates are for the initial cross-section components only. They do not include the panel cases.

Table 4: Initial contact response rates by PSU type and region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSU Type</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>1992 Response rate</th>
<th>1994 Response rate</th>
<th>1996 Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR MSA</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td>0.570</td>
<td>0.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>0.759</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>0.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>0.620</td>
<td>0.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>0.471</td>
<td>0.517</td>
<td>0.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSR MSA</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td>0.577</td>
<td>0.526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>0.699</td>
<td>0.717</td>
<td>0.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>0.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td>0.782</td>
<td>0.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSR Non-MSA</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>0.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>0.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td>0.830</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>0.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>0.762</td>
<td>0.946</td>
<td>0.810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Comparison of Weighted NES and CPS Age Group by Education Level Distributions

Table 5a below shows the current interview age by education distributions of 1992 cross-section cases in initial and subsequent interviews. The table includes weighted (base weight) percentages and unweighted percentages with estimates of the population percentages according to the Current Population Study included for comparison. We can see for example, that in the 1992 NES pre election sample there were 15 respondents age 22-29 with no high school diploma. These represent approximately 1.3 percent of the 1126 total respondents in this sample. When the base weight is used, the weighted percent for this group increases to about 1.6 percent. The 1992 CPS population estimates are listed in a column on the left. It is estimated that in 1992 about 2.4 percent of all eligible adults were 22-29 year-olds with no high school diploma. The shaded rows indicate totals by age group and a summary by education is provided at the bottom of the page. Table 5b gives the same information for the 1994 cross-section cases and Table 5c shows the 1996 cross-section distributions.

Table 5a:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE (Cur- EDUCATION)</th>
<th>HIGHEST CPS</th>
<th>1992 n</th>
<th>Unwtd %</th>
<th>Wghted n</th>
<th>Wghted %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>No College</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-29</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No HS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No HS</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No HS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No HS</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No HS</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70+</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No HS</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5a: (cont.):
Distribution of the 1992 NES Cross-section sample by current age and education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE (Current)</th>
<th>HIGHEST EDUCATION</th>
<th>1992 CPS n</th>
<th>Unwtd %</th>
<th>Wtd %</th>
<th>1994 post Unwtd Wghtd %</th>
<th>1996 pre Unwtd Wghtd %</th>
<th>1996 post Unwtd Wghtd %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>No College</td>
<td>4.3 13</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td>3.1 4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>7.3 17</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-29</td>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>2.4 9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>6.1 27</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>4.8 46</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>3.5 16</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>16.7 98</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>3.0 16</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>8.7 54</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>6.1 77</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>5.7 74</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>23.4 221</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>2.4 11</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>11.1 131</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>Unwtd %</td>
<td>Wtd %</td>
<td>Unwtd %</td>
<td>Wtd %</td>
<td>Unwtd %</td>
<td>Wtd %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>50-59</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>60-69</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>70+</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary by Education level:** 1994 post 1996 pre 1996 post

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>1994 post</th>
<th>1996 pre</th>
<th>1996 post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5b:

Distribution of the 1994 NES Cross-section sample by current age and education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>HIGHEST EDUCATION</th>
<th>1994 post</th>
<th>1996 pre</th>
<th>1996 post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPS (Sel,NR)</td>
<td>n unwtd %</td>
<td>n unwtd %</td>
<td>n unwtd %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Sel,NR)</td>
<td>(Sel,NR)</td>
<td>(Sel,NR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>No College</td>
<td>4.2 37 3.6 4.2</td>
<td>12 1.7 1.8 8</td>
<td>1.2 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td>3.1 18 1.7 2.4</td>
<td>6 0.8 1.1 5</td>
<td>0.8 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.3 55 5.3 6.6</td>
<td>18 2.5 3.0 13</td>
<td>2.0 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-29</td>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>2.3 14 1.4 1.3</td>
<td>6 0.8 1.0 3</td>
<td>0.5 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>5.5 45 4.3 4.5</td>
<td>23 3.2 3.8 17</td>
<td>2.6 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>5.3 58 5.6 5.7</td>
<td>31 4.3 4.0 27</td>
<td>4.1 3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>3.4 35 3.4 3.3</td>
<td>22 3.1 3.0 20</td>
<td>3.1 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.5 152 14.7 14.7</td>
<td>82 11.4 11.7 67</td>
<td>10.3 10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>2.9 21 2.0 2.1</td>
<td>12 1.7 1.7 9</td>
<td>1.4 1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>8.1 93 9.0 9.0</td>
<td>57 7.9 7.5 51</td>
<td>7.8 7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>6.6 73 7.1 6.8</td>
<td>53 7.4 7.3 47</td>
<td>7.2 7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>5.7 59 5.7 5.7</td>
<td>41 5.7 5.9 38</td>
<td>5.8 6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.3 246 23.7 23.7</td>
<td>163 22.7 22.4 145</td>
<td>22.2 22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>2.3 14 1.4 1.6</td>
<td>11 1.5 1.9 9</td>
<td>1.4 1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>6.1 53 5.1 6.0</td>
<td>43 6.0 6.5 41</td>
<td>6.3 6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>5.2 52 5.0 5.0</td>
<td>43 6.0 6.3 39</td>
<td>6.0 6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>5.4 67 6.5 6.6</td>
<td>57 7.9 8.1 53</td>
<td>8.1 8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.0 186 18.0 19.2</td>
<td>154 21.4 22.8 142</td>
<td>21.8 23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>2.4 16 1.5 1.6</td>
<td>12 1.7 1.6 12</td>
<td>1.8 1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>4.6 43 4.2 4.4</td>
<td>36 5.0 5.4 29</td>
<td>4.4 4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>2.8 24 2.3 2.2</td>
<td>16 2.2 2.1 16</td>
<td>2.4 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>2.8 29 2.8 3.1</td>
<td>25 3.5 3.8 25</td>
<td>3.8 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.5 112 10.8 11.1</td>
<td>89 12.4 13.0 82</td>
<td>12.6 13.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary by Education level:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Unwtd %</td>
<td>Wtd %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5c: Distribution of the 1996 NES Cross-section sample by current age and education
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>No HS Diploma</th>
<th>HS Diploma</th>
<th>Some College</th>
<th>College Graduate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22-29</td>
<td>2.0 4 1.0 0.8 2 0.6 0.5</td>
<td>4.9 18 4.5 3.9 13 3.9 3.3</td>
<td>5.0 13 3.3 2.9 10 3.0 2.9</td>
<td>3.7 17 4.3 4.0 16 4.8 4.4</td>
<td>15.6 52 13.1 11.5 41 12.2 11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>2.9 4 1.0 0.8 4 1.2 0.9</td>
<td>7.6 36 9.0 9.0 29 8.6 8.7</td>
<td>6.3 31 7.8 7.6 29 8.6 8.4</td>
<td>5.9 28 7.0 6.6 23 6.8 6.3</td>
<td>22.8 99 24.9 24.1 85 25.2 24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>2.4 5 1.3 1.0 4 1.2 0.9</td>
<td>6.6 23 5.8 6.2 18 5.3 5.6</td>
<td>5.5 25 6.3 6.8 20 5.9 6.3</td>
<td>5.7 22 5.5 5.5 19 5.6 5.7</td>
<td>20.1 75 18.8 19.6 61 18.1 18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>2.3 7 1.8 1.7 6 1.8 1.7</td>
<td>4.6 17 4.3 4.9 15 4.4 4.9</td>
<td>2.9 17 4.3 3.6 15 4.4 3.8</td>
<td>3.0 15 3.8 4.8 15 4.4 5.7</td>
<td>12.8 56 14.1 15.2 51 15.1 16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>2.8 9 2.3 1.9 9 2.7 2.3</td>
<td>3.7 12 3.0 2.3 11 3.3 2.6</td>
<td>1.9 9 2.3 2.5 7 2.1 2.2</td>
<td>1.8 7 1.8 2.2 6 1.8 2.3</td>
<td>10.1 37 9.3 8.9 33 9.8 9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70+</td>
<td>4.3 13 3.3 2.8 10 3.0 2.5</td>
<td>4.3 13 3.3 2.8 10 3.0 2.5</td>
<td>4.3 13 3.3 2.8 10 3.0 2.5</td>
<td>4.3 13 3.3 2.8 10 3.0 2.5</td>
<td>10.1 37 9.3 8.9 33 9.8 9.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary by Education level:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>1996 pre</th>
<th>1996 post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Post-stratification Factor for the Revised Weights:

The post-stratification factor for the revised NES cross-sectional weights was developed to address problems caused by under-representation of age or education groups. To do this, the corresponding CPS estimates were used as the benchmark standard. The post-stratification factor was calculated by dividing the CPS percent by the weighted (base weight) NES percent for each of the age by education subgroups. Note that the youngest age group consists of only two education groups (no college / at least some college) because of the small number of 18 to 21 year-olds in the samples (especially in 1994 and 1996) and because level of education is not as meaningful for the youngest age group since they may still be in school.

Tables 6a, 6b and 6c show the data used to construct the post-stratification factors for the combined panel and cross-section NES samples for each year. As an example of the calculation, in the 1994 NES sample (Table 6b) there were fifty 18-21 year olds with no college education. These people represent approximately 2.8 percent (unweighted) of the 1994 sample. When the base weight is applied, the weighted percent is about 3.5. On the left side of each table the CPS statistics for the corresponding year are listed. These are used as estimates of the population percentages by age and education. The post-stratification factor is calculated for each subgroup by dividing the CPS estimate by the weighted percent. In the 1994 example this is 4.2 divided by approximately 3.5. Although the percentages in the tables are shown to the nearest tenth of a percent, the calculation of the post-stratification factors used percents to the nearest hundredth of a percent.

Table 6a: Distributions and post-stratification factors for the combined 1992 samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>HIGHEST</th>
<th>1992 Unwtd</th>
<th>Wghtd</th>
<th>Post-strat</th>
<th>Unwtd</th>
<th>Wghtd</th>
<th>Post-strat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>CPS</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>% (Sel,NR)</td>
<td>factor n</td>
<td>% (Sel,NR)</td>
<td>factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>No College</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.313</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-29</td>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.506</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.354</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.857</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.833</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1.083</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0.763</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.009</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.204</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.013</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.118</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.020</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.959</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.594</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.182</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.055</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary by Education Level:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1992 pre</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1992 post</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Unwtd %</td>
<td>Wtd %</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Unwtd %</td>
<td>Wtd %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6b: Distributions and post-stratification factors for the combined 1994 samples

1994 post

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE (Cur- EDUCATION)</th>
<th>1994</th>
<th>Unwtd %</th>
<th>Wgtd %</th>
<th>Post-strat (Sel,NR) (94 cps)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-21 No College</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.5 1.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.7 1.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-29 No HS Diploma</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2 1.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.4 1.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.9 0.898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8 1.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 No HS Diploma</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.0 1.503</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>94 CPS</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Unwtd%</th>
<th>Wtd%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6c: Distributions and post-stratification factors for the combined 1996 samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>HIGHEST EDUCATION (Current)</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>Unwtd</th>
<th>Wghtd</th>
<th>Post-strat factor</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>Unwtd</th>
<th>Wghtd</th>
<th>Post-strat factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>No College</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.383</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.140</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-29</td>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.349</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.245</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.388</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.025</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>164</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1.013</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>375</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.865</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>0.726</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>316</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.331</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.914</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.672</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>216</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
60-69 No HS
Diploma  2.8   47   2.7   2.5   1.096  44   2.9   2.7   1.030
HS Diploma  3.7   73   4.3   3.9   0.956  68   4.4   4.0   0.923
Some College  1.9   40   2.3   2.4   0.778  38   2.5   2.5   0.744
College Graduate  1.8   39   2.3   2.3   0.771  37   2.4   2.5   0.715
TOTAL           10.1  199  11.6  11.1          187  12.2  11.7

70+   No HS
Diploma    4.3   81   4.7   3.9   1.098   75   4.9   4.0   1.063
HS Diploma  3.7   80   4.7   4.1   0.912   73   4.8   4.2   0.890
Some College  1.9   49   2.9   2.4   0.789  45   2.9   2.5   0.757
College Graduate   1.5   41   2.4   2.2   0.694  39   2.5   2.3   0.664
TOTAL           11.3  251  14.6  12.5          232  15.1  12.9

1714                     1534

Summary by Education level:   1996 pre                1996 post

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>1996 pre</th>
<th>1996 post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Unwtd%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1714</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. "Trimming of weights

The new weights for each sample -- 1992 pre and post, 1994 post and 1996 pre and post -- were calculated as the product of the corresponding base weight and the post-stratification factor. The resulting products were then "trimmed" at the 1st and 99th percentiles in order to control the potential for high variation caused by these weights. The results of trimming at the 1st and 99th percentiles are shown in Table 7. The column labels "Before" and "After" indicate whether the statistics refer to the weight before or after trimming.

Table 7: Comparison of final weight statistics before and after trimming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>1126</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>1795</td>
<td>1795</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
<td>2.4136</td>
<td>2.4038</td>
<td>2.4092</td>
<td>2.4015</td>
<td>2.4201</td>
<td>2.4129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>std dev</td>
<td>1.1252</td>
<td>1.0841</td>
<td>1.1075</td>
<td>1.0773</td>
<td>1.1817</td>
<td>1.1494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max</td>
<td>9.6008</td>
<td>5.5521</td>
<td>8.5612</td>
<td>5.2942</td>
<td>8.8935</td>
<td>6.5143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99th</td>
<td>5.5521</td>
<td>5.5521</td>
<td>5.2942</td>
<td>5.2942</td>
<td>6.6514</td>
<td>6.5143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>0.7796</td>
<td>0.7796</td>
<td>0.7471</td>
<td>0.7471</td>
<td>0.7999</td>
<td>0.7999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>min</td>
<td>0.6480</td>
<td>0.7796</td>
<td>0.6644</td>
<td>0.7471</td>
<td>0.6370</td>
<td>0.7999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Results:

The steps taken to address the 1996 NES overestimation of voting in the 1996 presidential election resulted in the development of post-stratified weights which account for individual selection probability, geographic related household nonresponse, and misrepresentation of any age by education subgroups. These revised, CPS-standardized weights were computed for the 1992 NES Pre and Post, 1994 NES Post and 1996 NES Pre and Post Election data sets. Users of previous weights released with the 1992, 1994 and 1996 data will find that these weights extend and combine the features of previously released weights.

Table 8 compares the weighted (final weights) distributions by age and education to the CPS estimates. It is evident that the use of the final weights results in a distribution which is more similar to CPS population estimates.

Table 8: Comparison of weighted (final weights) NES distribution to CPS population estimates for age by education subgroups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>HIGHEST EDUCATION</th>
<th>'92 CPS</th>
<th>'92pre NES</th>
<th>'92post NES</th>
<th>'94 CPS</th>
<th>'94post NES</th>
<th>'96 CPS</th>
<th>'96pre NES</th>
<th>'96post NES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>No College</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>6.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-29</td>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>5.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.60</td>
<td>16.61</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.45</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>15.63</td>
<td>15.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>7.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>6.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>5.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary by Education level:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>'92pre '92post</th>
<th>'94post</th>
<th>'96pre '96post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'92CPS NES NES</td>
<td>'94CPS NES NES</td>
<td>'96CPS NES NES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No HS Diploma</td>
<td>20.8 19.19 19.32</td>
<td>19.5 18.83 18.9</td>
<td>18.25 17.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>35.5 36.88 36.77</td>
<td>33.9 34.53 33.2</td>
<td>33.37 33.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>19.5 19.68 19.68</td>
<td>20.3 20.33 21.5</td>
<td>21.70 21.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final check on the revised weight is to use this trimmed final weight to estimate presidential election voting rates in 1992 and 1996. Table 9 shows that in both 1992 and 1996 the use of the final weight results in...
significantly lower estimates of voting.

Table 9: Calculated Voting Rates in the 1992 and 1996 Presidential elections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

>> SAMPLE DESIGN 1992 ELECTION STUDY

STUDY POPULATION

The study population for the 1992 National Pre/Post Election Study (NES) is defined to include all United States citizens of voting age on or before the 1992 Election Day. Eligible citizens must have resided in housing units, other than on military reservations, in the forty-eight coterminous states. This definition excludes persons living in Alaska or Hawaii and requires eligible persons to have been both a United States citizen and eighteen years of age on or before the 3rd of November 1992.

MULTI-STAGE AREA PROBABILITY SAMPLE DESIGN

The 1992 NES is based on a multi-stage area probability sample selected from the Survey Research Center's (SRC) National Sample design. Identification of the 1992 NES sample respondents was conducted using a four stage sampling process—a primary stage sampling of U.S. Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) and counties, followed by a second stage sampling of area segments, a third stage sampling of housing units within sampled area segments and concluding with the random selection of a single respondent from selected housing units. A detailed documentation of the SRC National Sample is provided in the SRC publication titled, 1980 SRC National Sample: Design and Development.

Primary Stage Selection

The selection of primary stage sampling units (PSUs), which depending on the sample stratum are either MSAs, single counties or groupings of small counties, is based on the county-level 1980 Census Reports of Population and Housing. Primary stage units were assigned to 84 explicit strata based on MSA/Non-MSA status, PSU size, and geographic location. Sixteen of the 84 strata contain only a single self-representing PSU, each of which is included with certainty in the primary stage of sample selection. The remaining 68 nonself-representing strata contain more than one PSU. From each of these nonself-representing strata, one PSU was sampled with probability proportionate to its size (PPS) measured in 1980 occupied housing units.

The full SRC National Sample of 84 primary stage selections was designed to be optimal for surveys roughly two to three times the size of the 1992 NES. To permit the flexibility needed for optimal design of smaller survey samples, the primary stage of the SRC National Sample can be readily partitioned into smaller subsamples of PSUs. Each of the partitions represents a stratified subselection from the full 84 PSU design.

Since the 1992 NES desired comparison of data over time from 1990 NES respondents, as well as an expanded representative sample of eligible 1992 respondents, a combined panel/cross-section sample was designed for the 1992 Pre/Post-Election Study.
The Panel portion of the 1992 sample was selected from the original 1990 NES sample which, at the Primary stage had been selected from the "one-half" partition of the 1980 SRC National Sample. The "A" one-half sample of the 1980 National Sample design includes 11 of the 16 self-representing MSA PSUs and a stratified subsampling of 34 (of the 68) nonself-representing PSUs of the SRC National Sample. The Panel portion of the 1992 NES is designed to allow longitudinal analysis of individual change since the panel cases follow the original proportionate distribution to the 1990 "A" one-half sample areas.

The 1992 NES Cross-Section encompasses both the panel cases and a new selection of cases from the two-thirds partition of the 1980 National Sample (that is the "A" plus the "B1" PSUs). The two-thirds 1980 National Sample design includes all 16 self-representing PSUs and 11 additional nonself-representing PSUs for a total of 45 (of 68) nonself-representing PSUs. The additional cases were added to the 1992 NES to supplement the Panel selections such that when the Panel and new Cross-section selections are combined for analysis a representative cross-section of the study population has been maintained.

Table 9 identifies the PSUs for the 1992 National Election Study by MSA status and Region. The PSUs in the Panel portion of the sample design are shown in standard print on this table while those PSUs added for the two-thirds Cross-section are shown in italics.

Table 9: PSUs in the 1992 NES Pre- and Post-Election Survey
By: MSA Status and Region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>Self-representing MSAs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>New York, NY-NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philadelphia, PA-NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boston, MA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nassau-Suffolk, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pittsburgh, PA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Louis, MO*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minneapolis, MN-WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Washington, DC-MD-VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dallas-Ft Worth, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Houston, TX*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baltimore, MD*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>Nonself-representing MSAs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>Buffalo, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newark, NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Haven, CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atlantic City, NJ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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NOTE: The PSU's marked with an asterisk are Self-Representing for sample designs which use the two-thirds or larger portion of the sample (i.e., in this case, the combined cross-section and panel design). For the half-sample design (i.e., in this case, the panel portion alone) only 6 of the 16 Self-Representing areas remain Self-Representing. The other ten Self-Representing PSU's are paired and only five are used in the half-sample design, each representing both itself and the PSU it is paired with.
The second stage of the 1980 National Sample was selected directly from computerized files that were prepared from the 1980 Census summary tape file series (STF1-B). The designated second-stage sampling units (SSUs), termed "area segments", are comprised of census blocks in the metropolitan primary areas and enumeration districts (EDs) in the rural areas of both non-MSA and MSA primary areas. Each SSU block, block combination or enumeration district was assigned a measure of size equal to the total 1980 occupied housing unit count for the area (minimum = 50). Second stage sampling of area segments was performed with probabilities proportionate to the assigned measures of size.

A three-step process of ordering the SSUs within the primary areas produced an implicit stratification of the area segments in the second stage sampling frame, stratified at the county level by geographic location and population. Area segments were stratified within county at the Minor Civil Division (MCD) level by size and income, and at the block and ED level by location within the MCD or county. (For details, refer to the SRC publication, 1980 NATIONAL SAMPLE: DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT.)

Systematic PPS sampling was used to select the area segments from the second stage sampling frame for each county. In the self-representing (SR) PSUs the number of sample area segments varied in proportion to the size of the primary stage unit, from a high of 12 Cross-section and 12 Panel area segments in the SR New York MSA, 6 Cross-section segments and 5 Panel segments in the San Francisco MSA, to a low of 4 Cross-section and no Panel area segments in the smaller SR PSUs such as Minneapolis and Atlanta MSAs. Most Nonself-representing (NSR) half-sample (A) PSUs were represented by 2 Cross-section and 6 Panel area segments; most of the eleven other (B1) NSR PSUs had 6 Cross-section area segments (and, of course, no Panel segments). A total of 487 area segments were selected, 206 Cross-section and 281 Panel segments, 151 in the sixteen self-representing PSUs and 336 in the nonself-representing PSUs as shown in Table 10.

Table 10: Number of Cross-Section and Panel Area Segments in the 1992 NES Sample Showing PSU Name, National-Sample Stratum and Partition, and MSA Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSU#</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Six Largest Self-representing PSUs

1 A New York, NY-NJ 12 12
2 A Los Angeles, CA 12 9
3 A Chicago, IL 8 8
4 A Philadelphia, PA-NJ 6 6
5 A Detroit, MI 6 6
6 A San Francisco, CA 6 5

Ten Remaining Self-representing PSUs

7 B1 Washington, DC-MD-VA 6 0
8 B1 Dallas-Ft Worth, TX 6 0
9 A Houston, TX 0 7
10 A Boston, MA 0 6
11 B1 Nassau-Suffolk, NY 4 0
12 A St Louis, MO-IL 0 6
13 A Pittsburgh, PA 0 6
14 A Baltimore, MD 0 6
15 B1 Minneapolis, MN-WI 4 0
16 B1 Atlanta, GA 4 0
Nonself-representing MSAs: Northeast
17 A Buffalo, NY 2 6
18 B1 Newark, NJ 6 0
21 A New Haven, CT 2 6
23 A Atlantic City, NJ 2 6
24 A Manchester, NH 2 6
Nonself-representing MSAs: North Central
26 A Milwaukee, WI 2 6
27 A Dayton, OH 2 6
28 B1 Kansas City, MO-KS 6 0
29 A Des Moines, IA 2 6
31 A Grand Rapids, MI 2 6
32 A Fort Wayne, IN 2 6
33 A Steubenville, OH-WV 2 6
34 B1 Saginaw, MI 6 0
Nonself-representing MSAs: South
36 A Birmingham, AL 2 6
39 A Columbus, GA-AL 2 6
40 A Miami, FL 2 6
42 B1 Jacksonville, FL 6 0
43 A Lakeland, FL 2 6
44 A McAllen, TX 2 6
45 B1 Waco, TX 6 0
47 A Wheeling, WV-OH 2 6
49 A Knoxville, TN 2 6
50 A Richmond, VA 2 6
Nonself-representing MSAs: West
53 A Seattle, WA 2 6
55 A Denver, CO 2 6
56 A Anaheim, CA 2 6
57 B1 Riverside-San Bernardino, CA 6 0
58 A Fresno, CA 2 6
59 A Eugene, OR 2 6
60 B1 Phoenix, AZ 6 0
Nonself-representing Non-MSAs: Northeast
63 A Schuyler, NY 2 6
64 B1 Gardner, MA 6 0
Nonself-representing Non-MSAs: North Central
65 A Sanilac, MI 2 6
66 B1 Decatur, IN 6 0
68 A Phillips, KS/ ** 6
Saline, NE 2 **
70 A Mower, MN 2 6
Nonself-representing Non-MSAs: South
73 A Bulloch, GA 2 6
74 B1 Sabine, LA 5 0
76 A Hale, TX 2 6
77 A Monroe, AR/ ** 6
Ashley, AR 2 **
78 A Bedford, TN 2 6
80 B1 Montgomery, VA 5 0
81 A Robeson, NC 2 6
Nonself-representing Non-MSAs: West
82 A ElDorado-Alpine, CA 2 6
84 A Carbon, WY 2 6
** In two Non-SMSA National Sample strata (68 and 77) the 1980 materials from which the Panel area segments had been selected was exhausted (i.e., there were insufficient remaining SSUs from which to select new Cross-section area segments), so a new Primary selection had to be made from those two strata. Therefore, the Panel area segments for stratum 68 are from PSU Phillips County, KS, and the Cross-section area segments are from Saline County, NE; the Panel area segments for stratum 77 are from PSU Monroe County, AR, and the Cross-section area segments are from Ashley County, AR.

Although 281 segments were used in the 1990 NES, only 272 Panel segments appear in the 1992 NES Panel. The difference is due to some segments used in 1990 not having any interviews completed in 1990 and, therefore, not becoming part of the 1992 Panel.

Third Stage Selection of Housing Units

For each area segment selected in the second sampling stage, a listing was made of all housing units located within the physical boundaries of the segment. For segments with a very large number of expected housing units, all housing units in a subselected part of the segment were listed. The final equal probability sample of housing units for the 1992 NES was systematically selected from the housing unit listings for the sampled area segments.

The overall probability of selection for 1992 NES Cross-Section households was \( f = 0.00003988 \) or 0.3988 in 10,000. The equal probability sample of households was achieved for the combined Cross-Section/Panel design by using the standard multi-stage sampling technique of setting the sampling rate for selecting housing units within area segments to be inversely proportional to the PPS probabilities (see above) used to select the PSU and area segment.

Five 1992 Panel replicates were designated for the entire "frame" of households in which a complete interview was obtained in the 1990 NES study (2000 - 11 partial interviews = 1989 1990 interview HUs). The original 1990 sample lines had been selected from the National Sample ("A" or "half-sample" PSUs) to be inversely proportional to the PPS probabilities used to select the area segments as described in the previous paragraph.

The new Cross-Section component of the 1992 NES sample design was disproportionately allocated to the "B1" PSUs to supplement the Panel cases such that when cross-sectional analysis was undertaken, combining new cross-section cases with panel cases would yield an equal probability sample of households. The distribution of the combined sample would be that required by the two-thirds design.

Fourth Stage Respondent Selection

Within each sampled new cross-section housing unit, the SRC interviewer prepared a complete listing of all eligible household members. Using an objective procedure described by Kish (1949)[9] a single respondent was then selected at random to be interviewed. Regardless of circumstances, no substitutions were permitted for the designated respondent. This technique had also been used in 1990 to select the original Panel respondents. In 1992 the same Panel respondent (R) was sought for interview as had been interviewed in 1990.
The targeted completed interview sample size for the 1992 NES Pre/Post-Election Survey was \( n = 2,057 \) total cases. In the original sample size computation, the following assumptions were made for the cross-section component of the sample: response rate for the pre-election interview = .72 and of these 95% were assumed to be available and cooperative for the post-election interview, combined occupancy/eligibility rate = .83. These assumptions were derived from survey experience in the 1986 NES Post Election Survey\[10\]. The assumptions made for the panel component were: .913 recontact rate and .75 response rate for the pre-election interview. The same .95 response rate for the post-election interview was assumed for both the panel and the cross-section component.

To most closely tailor the field effort to the sample field experience during this study, both parts of the selected sample had five replicates designated. Replicates 1 and 2 were considered the "base sample", certain to be released. 55% of this base was designated as Replicate 1 to be released September 1, 1992 and 45% designated as Replicate 2 to be released October 1, 1992. The other three replicates were designated "Reserve" replicates, one or more to be released for field work October 1, 1992 at the discretion of NES study staff. Replicate 3 (Reserve replicate 1) was never, in fact, released. Replicates 4 and 5 (Reserve replicates 2 and 3) were released with Base sample replicate 2 on October 1, 1992. Each replicate is a proper subsample of the NES sample.

A subsampling of one-third of selected addresses was made in certain cases when selected lines were determined to be within locked buildings, in gated subdivisions or in areas which posed a danger to interviewing staff. This allowed concentration of greater field effort in these circumstances to obtain at least some interviews. In cases where this was done, appropriate weighting of the results will be used to compensate. (This is not reflected in the following tables however).

Table 11 provides a full description of the original sample design specifications applied to the Base Sample and also indicates the number of HU listings assigned to each replicate. As stated above, Replicates 1 and 2 constitute the Base Sample; Replicates 3, 4 and 5 are reserve replicates. Replicate 3 was, in fact, never released for field work.

### Table 11: Original Sample Design Specifications and Assumptions 1992 National Pre/Post-Election Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross-Section Component (Supplemental)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed Post/ interview</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Response Rate</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Pre/ interview</td>
<td>1,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Rate</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible sample households</td>
<td>1,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy/Eligibility Rate[11]</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel Recontact Rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample HU listings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replicates 1 and 2</td>
<td>1,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replicate 1 (incl above)[12]</td>
<td>961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replicate 2 (incl above)[13]</td>
<td>799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replicate 3 (Reserve)[14]</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12 compares the original sample design specifications and assumptions for the new Cross-Section Component of the 1992 NES as applied to the Base Sample (as in Table 11) and as applied to the actually released sample (Replicates 1, 2, 4 and 5) to the actual outcome for that component. Table 13 makes a similar comparison for the Panel Component of the 1992 NES Sample and Table 14 presents a summary of the figures for the combined Cross-Section/Panel Sample. The response rates which appear in these tables are calculated using both complete and partial (short-form) interviews. An alternative response rate which excludes short-form interviews is described in “Response Rates”, above.

### Table 12: Original Sample Design Specifications and Actual Sample Design Outcomes for the Cross-Section Component of the 1992 National Pre/Post-Election Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Specifications</th>
<th>Original S &amp; A Specifications</th>
<th>Applied to Actual Release</th>
<th>(Reps. 1 &amp; 2)</th>
<th>(Reps. 1,2,4 &amp; 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed Post/Interviews</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Response Rate</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Released for Recontact</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>1,161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Pre/Interviews</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>1,161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Rate</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible Sample Households</td>
<td>1,462</td>
<td>1,613</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy/Eligibility Rate[17]</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsampling for dangerous/locked areas</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample HU listings</td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td>1,943</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample growth from update[18] -- 1.03
Selected Sample lines 1,760 1,886

Actual
Outcome

Completed Post/Interviews 1,005
Contact/Response Rate .89
Released for Recontact 1,126
Completed Pre/Interviews 1,126
Response Rate .74
Eligible Sample Households 1,522
Occupancy/Eligibility Rate .80
1,900
Subsampling for dangerous/locked areas .99[19]
Sample HU listings 1,923
Sample growth from update 1.02
Selected Sample lines 1,886

Table 13: Original Sample Design Specifications and Assumptions and Actual Sample Design Outcomes for the Panel Component of the 1992 National Pre/Post-Election Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Specifications</th>
<th>Original S &amp; A Specifications &amp; Assumptions &amp; Assumptions (Reps 1 &amp; 2)</th>
<th>Actual Release (Reps 1,2,4 &amp; 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed Post/ Interviews</td>
<td>1,057</td>
<td>1,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Response Rate</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Released for Recontact</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>1,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Pre/Interviews</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>1,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Rate</td>
<td>.75[20]</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible Sample Households</td>
<td>1,483</td>
<td>1,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel Recontact Rate</td>
<td>.913</td>
<td>.913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample HU listings Released</td>
<td>1,625</td>
<td>1,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Panel cases</td>
<td>1,989</td>
<td>1,989</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actual
Outcome

Completed Post/Interviews 1,250
Contact/Response Rate .92
Released for Recontact 1,361
Completed Pre/Interviews 1,361
Response Rate .78
Eligible Sample Households 1,752
Panel Recontact Rate .979
Sample HU listings Released 1,789

Total Panel cases 1,989

Table 14: Original Sample Design Specifications and Assumptions and Actual Sample Design Outcomes for the Combined Cross-Section/Panel Sample. 1992 National Pre/Post-Election Survey
In comparing the second column of Table 12 with the third column, it can be seen that, for the 1992 Cross-Section component, the sample growth from the update procedure was slightly less than expected; this was perhaps due to the fact that many of the new cross-section segments had been listed within the year previous to field dates for the 1992 NES study. The original sample design specifications also overestimated the actual occupancy/eligibility rates resulting in 91 fewer eligible HUs than estimated. However, since the actual response rate was higher than estimated, completed pre-election interviews fell only 35 short of the number estimated. The assumptions for response rate and occupancy/eligibility rate were based on the 1986 NES field experience for a probability sample based on the entire two-thirds design of the National Sample.

The actual response rate for the 1992 cross-section component (.74), as well as the occupancy/eligibility rate very likely reflects the disproportionate allocation of the new cross-section segments in the B1 areas of the National Sample which may well have different occupancy/eligibility and response rates than any overall past NES rates on which the original assumptions were based.

The number of Post-election interviews obtained, 1,005, was closer to the target of 1000 interviews projected for the Base Sample alone than the 1,103 projected for the actual 1,886 sample lines released.

For the Panel Component (see Table 13), both the Panel recontact rate and the response rate exceeded assumptions resulting in 142 more pre-election interviews than expected. A lower than assumed response rate for the post-election interview reduced the excess to 92 more post-election interviews than projected for the release of the Panel base sample plus replicates 4 and 5 (reserve replicates 2 and 3).

The figures for the combined cross-section sample shown in Table 14 show completed pre-election interviews of 107 over expected. Due to lower than assumed response rate for the post-election interview, combined with lower cross-section and higher panel overall response and occupancy/eligibility rates, the final total number of post election interviews was 6 fewer than the
WEIGHTED ANALYSIS OF 1992 NES DATA

The area probability sample design for the 1992 NES results in an equal probability sample of U.S. households. However, within sample households a single adult respondent is chosen at random to be interviewed. Since the number of eligible adults may vary from one household to another, the random selection of a single adult introduces inequality into respondents' selection probabilities. In analysis, a respondent selection weight should be used to compensate for these unequal selection probabilities. The value of the respondent selection weight is exactly equal to the number of eligible adults in the household from which the random respondent was selected. The use of the respondent selection weight is strongly encouraged, despite past evaluations which have shown these weights to have little significant impact on the values of NES estimates of descriptive statistics.

The Sampling Section has provided two final person level analysis weights which will incorporate sampling, nonresponse and post-stratification factors. One weight variable (#3009) is for use with Panel cases only; the other weight variable (#3008) is for the 1992 NES Cross-section (which includes both panel and new cross-section cases.) Analysts interested in developing their own nonresponse or post-stratification adjustment factors must request access to the necessary sample control data from the NES Board.

CONSTRUCTION OF ANALYSIS WEIGHTS

Nonresponse adjustment factors were constructed at the household level separately for Panel and new Cross-Section component cases. Nonresponse adjustment cells were formed by crossing PSU type (Self-representing, Nonself-representing MSA or non-MSA) by the nine Census divisions (New England, Middle Atlantic, East North Central, West North Central, South Atlantic, East South Central, West South Central, Mountain, and Pacific). A nonresponse factor equal to the inverse of the response rate in each cell was applied to the interview cases. In order to have a minimum of approximately 25 cases in each nonresponse adjustment cell, some cells were collapsed across Census divisions in the same Census region.

An intermediate weight was constructed by multiplying the probability of selection of the household by the nonresponse adjustment factor by the number of eligible persons in the household[22]. This intermediate weight was used to produce a weighted sex by age category by Census Region table. The age categories used were: 18-44, 45-64, and 65+. Post-stratification factors were constructed to match the sample proportions in the 24 sex by age by Region cells to the July 1991 Census population totals (United States Department of Commerce News Public Information Office Press Release - CB92-93).

The two final analysis weights were each centered to a mean of 1.0 so that the sum of the weights equals the number of respondents (1,359 for the 1990-92 Panel and 2,485 for the 1992 Cross-section).

COMPARING THE 1992 NES TO PREVIOUS NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES

Earlier National Election Studies data collections did not include weights to adjust for nonresponse and the unequal probability of selection at the household level. Thus, weighting the 1992 NES data by V3009 (for analysis of the Panel cases) or by V3008 (for combined analysis of the panel and new cross-section cases) produces estimates that are not strictly comparable to
those obtained from previous National Election Studies that were not weighted to incorporate sampling, nonresponses and post-stratification factors.

Analysis comparing data from the 1992 NES data to previous NES data collections should employ V7000.

Because approximately half of the respondents to the 1992 NES were part of a panel first interviewed in 1990, to be comparable with previous NES cross-section data collections, the combined 1992 panel and new cross-section data must be weighted to correct for panel attrition and the aging of the panel respondents. Panel attrition is not uniform across demographic groups. Some respondents (the mobile and those with the least amount of formal education) are more susceptible to panel attrition. By definition, panel respondents are two years older than the cross-section respondents. And by definition, there are almost no 18 or 19 year-olds among the panel respondents interviewed in 1992 (because an 18 year-old in 1992 would have been 16 years-old in 1990 and ineligible for the 1990 study). Weighting of the panel respondents is necessary to ensure comparability with past NES data collections.

V7000 corrects the combined panel and cross-section cases for the panel attrition and aging that occurred among the panel respondents. This weight should be used when comparing estimates made on the 1992 NES data to estimates made on previous (unweighted) NES data collections. V7000 does not appear in the April 1993 CPS Early Release Version of the 1992 National Election Study.

CONSTRUCTION OF V7000

To construct this weight, panel respondents were classified by age (17-24, 25-39, 40-64, 65-74, 75 and over), education (less than high school, high school diploma, and more than high school education), and mobility (whether or not the respondent had moved between 1990 and 1992). Cross-classification of these three variables produced a 30-celled table (5 x 3 x 2) for each of the following: (1) 1990 panel respondents who comprised the panel portion of the sample “universe” for the 1992 study (N=1769); and (2) panel respondents interviewed in 1992 (N=1359). The weight was constructed by dividing the value of each cell in the 1990 table (1) by the value of the corresponding cell in the 1992 table (2). (For example, 10.9 percent of the 1,769 1990 panel respondents were age 40-64/had more than high school education/ had not moved. In 1992, respondents in the cell defined by these same categories comprised 11.8 percent of the 1359 panel respondents interviewed. The case weight for this group of respondents is 10.9/11.8 = .9237.) In order to have a minimum of approximately 25 cases in each cell, some cells were collapsed.

This procedure centers the weight variable V7000 so that it has a mean of 1.0 and the sum of the weights (2488) is approximately equal to the actual number of combined panel and cross-section respondents (2,485). Respondents who are part of the new cross-section have the value "1.0000" on V7000.

SAMPLING ERRORS OF 1992 NES ESTIMATES

SAMPLING ERROR CALCULATION PROGRAMS

The probability sample design for the 1992 National Election Study permits the calculation of estimates of sampling error for survey statistics. For calculating sampling errors of statistics from complex sample surveys, the OSIRIS statistical analysis and data management software system offers the PSALMS and REPERR programs. PSALMS is a general purpose sampling error program which incorporates the Taylor Series approximation approach to the estimation of variances of ratios (including means, scale variables, indices,
Estimation of variances for complex sample survey estimates requires a computation model. Individual data records must be assigned sampling error codes which reflect the complex structure of the sample and are compatible with the computation algorithms of the various programs. The sampling error codes for the 1992 NES are included as variables #3068 and #3069 in the ICPSR Public Use data set. The assigned sampling error codes are designed to facilitate sampling error computation according to a paired selection model for both Taylor Series approximation and Replication method programs.

For the Panel Component segments, two sampling error (SE) codes have been included for analysis of 1992 data. For longitudinal analysis of Panel data alone, the original 1990 SE code should be used since this reflects the half-sample design of the 1990 NES sample. For any cross-sectional analysis, where Panel data is combined with new cross-section data, the 1992 SE code must be used. Table 15 provides a description of how individual sampling error code values for Panel only data are to be paired for sampling error computations. Thirty (30) pairs or strata of sampling error computation units (SECU) are defined. Each SECU in a stratum pair includes cases assigned to a single sampling error code value. The exceptions are the second SECU in stratum 27 which is comprised of cases assigned sampling code values 36 AND 55 and the second SECU in stratum 29 which is comprised of cases with SECU 61 AND 63.

Table 15: 1992 Pre/Post-Election Survey: Panel-Only Analysis Paired Selection Model for Sampling Error Computations (1990 Sampling Error Codes - Variable #3069)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair (Stratum)</th>
<th>(SECU) 1 of 2</th>
<th>(SECU) 2 of 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 16 shows the Strata and SECU codes to be used for the paired selection model for sampling error computations for any 1992 cross-sectional analyses using the combined cross-section/panel data. The 42 strata reflect the expanded 2/3ths National Sample design used in 1992.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>(SECU) 1 of 2</th>
<th>(SECU) 2 of 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It can be seen from this table that the three-digit 1992 SE code is comprised of: first the two-digit SE Stratum code followed by the one-digit SECU code.

Generalized Sampling Error Results for the 1992 NES

To assist NES analysts, the OSIRIS PSALMS program was used to compute sampling errors for a wide-ranging example set of means and proportions estimated from the 1988 NES Pre-election Survey data set[24]. For each estimate, sampling errors were computed for the total sample and for fifteen demographic and political affiliation subclasses of the 1988 NES Pre-Election Survey sample. The results of these sampling error computations were then summarized and translated into the general usage sampling error table provided in Table 17.

Incorporating the pattern of "design effects" observed in the extensive set of example computations, Table 17 provides approximate standard errors for percentage estimates based on the 1988 NES. To use the table, examine the column heading to find the percentage value which best approximates the value of the estimated percentage that is of interest[25]. Next, locate the approximate sample size base (denominator for the proportion) in the left-hand row margin of the table. To find the approximate standard error of a percentage estimate, simply cross-reference the appropriate column (percentage) and row (sample size base). Note: the tabulated values represent approximately one standard error for the percentage estimate. To construct an approximate confidence interval, the analyst should apply the appropriate critical point from the "z" distribution (e.g. z=1.96 for a two-sided 95% confidence interval half-width). Furthermore, the approximate standard errors in the table apply only to single point estimates of percentages not to the difference between two percentage estimates.

The generalized variance results presented in Table 17 are a useful tool for initial, cursory examination of the NES survey results. For more in depth analysis and reporting of critical estimates, analysts are encouraged to compute exact estimates of standard errors using the appropriate choice of a sampling error program and computation model.

Table 17: Generalized Variance Table.  
1992 NES Pre-Election Survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>40% or 30% or 20% or 10% or 60%</th>
<th>70%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>90%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>5.385</td>
<td>5.277</td>
<td>4.933</td>
<td>4.308</td>
<td>3.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.912</td>
<td>3.824</td>
<td>3.581</td>
<td>3.128</td>
<td>2.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>3.278</td>
<td>3.210</td>
<td>3.006</td>
<td>2.260</td>
<td>1.962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>2.905</td>
<td>2.846</td>
<td>2.661</td>
<td>2.324</td>
<td>1.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>2.663</td>
<td>2.603</td>
<td>2.437</td>
<td>2.128</td>
<td>1.593</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
>> SAMPLE DESIGN 1994 NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY

STUDY POPULATION

The study population for the 1994 National Post-Election Study (NES) is defined to include all United States citizens of voting age on or before the 1994 Election Day. Eligible citizens must have resided in housing units, other than on military reservations, in the forty-eight coterminous states. This definition excludes persons living in Alaska or Hawaii and requires eligible persons to have been both a United States citizen and eighteen years of age on or before the 8th of November 1994.

MULTI-STAGE AREA PROBABILITY SAMPLE DESIGN

The 1994 NES is based on a multi-stage area probability sample selected from the Survey Research Center's (SRC) National Sample design. Identification of the 1994 NES sample respondents was conducted using a four stage sampling process—a primary stage sampling of U.S. Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) and counties, followed by a second stage sampling of area segments, a third stage sampling of housing units within sampled area segments and concluding with the random selection of a single respondent from selected housing units. A detailed documentation of the SRC National Sample is provided in the SRC publication titled 1980 SRC National Sample: Design and Development.

Primary Stage Selection

The selection of primary stage sampling units (PSUs), which depending on the sample stratum are either MSAs, single counties or groupings of small counties, is based on the county-level 1980 Census Reports of Population and Housing. Primary stage units were assigned to 84 explicit strata based on MSA/Non-MSA status, PSU size, and geographic location. Sixteen of the 84 strata contain only a single self-representing PSU, each of which is included with certainty in the primary stage of sample selection. The remaining 68 nonself-representing strata contain more than one PSU. From each of these nonself-representing strata, one PSU was sampled with probability proportionate to its size (PPS) measured in 1980 occupied housing units.

The full SRC National Sample of 84 primary stage selections was designed to be optimal for surveys roughly two to three times the size of the 1994 NES. To permit the flexibility needed for optimal design of smaller survey samples, the primary stage of the SRC National Sample can be readily partitioned into smaller subsamples of PSUs such as one-half sample or two-thirds sample partition. Each of the partitions represents a stratified subsampling from the full 84 PSU design. The one-half partition of the 1980 National Sample (i.e., the "A" primary sampling units or PSUs) includes 11 of the 16 self-representing MSA PSUs and a stratified subsampling of 34 of the 68 nonself-representing PSUs of the SRC National Sample. The two-thirds partition includes all of the "A" PSUs plus "B1" PSUs, i.e., 5 additional self-representing PSUs and 11 additional nonself-representing PSUs.

Since the 1994 NES desired comparison of data over time from 1992 NES
respondents, as well as a representative sample of eligible 1994 respondents, the 1994 NES sample design includes both a panel and a cross-section component. The panel component of the 1994 design consists of all respondents from the cross-section component of the 1992 NES sample. The 1994 cross-section component is a new selection of respondents from an area probability sample of households taken from the two-thirds partition of the SRC National Sample.

Due to sample design decisions in 1992, when the NES sample moved from using the one-half sample partition to the two-thirds sample partition of the SRC National Sample, the cross-section portion of the 1992 NES sample included a disproportionate number of selections from segments in "B1" PSUs (see Table 2). This same disproportionate distribution is, of course, reflected in the 1994 Panel component of the 1994 NES sample. While this does lead to some statistical inefficiency in the form of increased variance of survey estimates relative to that of an even distribution across the two-thirds partition primary areas, since the "B1" PSU areas do represent a proper subsample of the 1980 National Sample design, separate longitudinal analysis of the Panel component of the 1994 NES may be undertaken as well as analysis of combined Panel and Cross-section data [2].

Table 1 identifies the PSUs for the 1994 National Election Study by MSA status and Region. The "B1" PSUs in the Panel portion of the sample design which received the disproportionate allocation in 1992 to supplement the half-sample are shown in italic print on this table; all PSUs on this table are proportionately represented in the 1994 two-thirds Cross-Section Sample.

Table 1: PSUs in the 1994 NES Post-Election Survey
By MSA Status and Region
(B1 PSUs are marked *)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>Self-representing MSAs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>New York, NY-NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philadelphia, PA-NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nassau-Suffolk, NY*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pittsburgh, PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Louis, MO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minneapolis, MN-WI*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Washington, DC-MD-VA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dallas-Ft Worth, TX*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baltimore, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atlanta, GA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>Nonself-representing MSAs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>Buffalo, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newark, NJ*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Haven, CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atlantic City, NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manchester, NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Milwaukee, WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Dayton, OH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Second Stage Selection of Area Segments

The second stage of the 1994 NES National Sample was selected directly from computerized files that were prepared from the 1990 [3] Census file (PL94-171 file on CD Rom) which contains the block-level 1990 Census total housing unit (HU) data. The designated second-stage sampling units (SSUs), termed "area segments", are comprised of census blocks in the metropolitan (MSA) primary areas and either census blocks or enumeration districts (EDs) in the rural areas of non-MSA primary areas. Each SSU block, block combination or enumeration district for non-MSA PSUs was assigned a measure of size equal to the total 1980 occupied housing unit count for the area; MSA SSU block(s) were assigned a minimum measure of 72 1990 total HUs per SSU. Second stage sampling of area segments was performed with probabilities proportionate to the assigned measures of size (PPS).

A three-step process of ordering the SSUs within the primary areas produced an implicit stratification of the area segments in the second stage sampling frame, stratified at the county level by geographic location and population.
Area segments were stratified within county at the Minor Civil Division (MCD) level by size and income, and at the block and ED level by location within the MCD or county. (For details, refer to the SRC publication, 1980 National Sample: Design and Development.)

For the 1994 NES Panel/Cross-section sample the number of area segments used in each PSU varies. In the self-representing (SR) PSUs the number of sample area segments varied in proportion to the size of the primary stage unit, from a high of 12 Cross-section and 7 Panel area segments in the self-representing New York MSA, to a low of 4 Cross-section and no Panel area segments in the smaller self-representing PSUs such as Pittsburgh and Boston MSAs. Most Nonself-representing (NSR) PSUs were represented by 6 Cross-section and 2 Panel area segments except for "B1" PSUs for which there are either 5 or 6 Panel segments. A total of 554 area segments were selected, 191 Panel and 363 Cross-Section segments, 157 in the sixteen self-representing PSUs and 397 in the nonself-representing PSUs as shown in Table 2.

In most cases, both Cross-Section and Panel selections were been made from the same area segments within each PSU, so in actual fact a total of 376 distinct National Sample area segments have been used for the 1994 NES Post-Election Study.

Table 2: Number [4] of Cross-Section and Panel Area Segments in the 1994 NES Sample Showing PSU Name, National-Sample Stratum and Partition, and MSA Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSU #/ Partition</th>
<th>National Sample Stratum</th>
<th>PSU Name</th>
<th># of 1994 NES Cross-section Sample Segs.</th>
<th># of 1994 NES Panel Sample Segments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Six Largest Self-representing PSUs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>New York, NY-NJ</td>
<td>12 (7)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502 A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>12 (5)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503 A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504 A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Philadelphia, PA-NJ</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505 A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506 A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>6 (5)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ten Remaining Self-representing PSUs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507 B1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Washington, DC-MD-VA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508 B1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Dallas-Ft Worth, TX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509 A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510 A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511 B1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Nassau-Suffolk, NY</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512 A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>St Louis, MO-IL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513 A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Pittsburgh, PA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>514 A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Baltimore, MD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515 B1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Minneapolis, MN-WI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516 B1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nonself-representing MSAs: Northeast</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>517 A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Buffalo, NY</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518 B1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Newark, NJ</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521 A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>New Haven, CT</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523 A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Atlantic City, NJ</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524 A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Manchester, NH</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Nonself-representing MSAs: North Central

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Name, City, State/Region</th>
<th>Digits</th>
<th>MSAs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>526</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Milwaukee, WI</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Dayton, OH</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Kansas City, MO-KS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Des Moines, IA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Grand Rapids, MI</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Fort Wayne, IN</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>533</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Steubenville, OH-WV</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>534</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Saginaw, MI</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Nonself-representing MSAs: South

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Name, City, State/Region</th>
<th>Digits</th>
<th>MSAs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>536</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Birmingham, AL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>539</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Columbus, GA-AL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Miami, FL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>542</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Jacksonville, FL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>543</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Lakeland, FL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>McAllen, TX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Waco, TX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>547</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Wheeling, WV-OH</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>549</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Knoxville, TN</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Richmond, VA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Nonself-representing MSAs: West

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Name, City, State/Region</th>
<th>Digits</th>
<th>MSAs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>553</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>556</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Anaheim, CA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>557</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Riverside-San Bernardino, CA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>558</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Fresno, CA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>559</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Eugene, OR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Nonself-representing Non-MSAs: Northeast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Name, City, State/Region</th>
<th>Digits</th>
<th>MSAs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>463</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Schuyler, NY</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>464</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Gardner, MA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Nonself-representing Non-MSAs: North Central

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Name, City, State/Region</th>
<th>Digits</th>
<th>MSAs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>465</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Sanilac, MI</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>466</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Decatur, IN</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Saline, NE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>470</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Mower, MN</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Nonself-representing Non-MSAs: South

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Name, City, State/Region</th>
<th>Digits</th>
<th>MSAs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>473</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Bulloch, GA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Sabine, LA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>476</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Hale, TX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Ashley, AR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>478</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Bedford, TN</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Montgomery, VA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Robeson, NC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Nonself-representing Non-MSAs: West
For each area segment selected in the second sampling stage, a listing was made of all housing units located within the physical boundaries of the segment. For segments with a very large number of expected housing units, all housing units in a subselected part of the segment were listed. The final equal probability sample of housing units for the 1994 NES was systematically selected from the housing unit listings for the sampled area segments.

The new Cross-Section component of the 1994 NES sample design was selected from the SRC National Sample to yield an equal probability sample of households. The distribution of the 1994 cross-section sample is that required by the two-thirds design of the SRC National Sample. The overall probability of selection for 1994 NES Cross-Section households was \( f = 0.00001885 \) or \( .1885 \) in 10,000. The equal probability sample of households was achieved for the Cross-Section design by using the standard multi-stage sampling technique of setting the sampling rate for selecting housing units within area segments to be inversely proportional to the PPS probabilities used to select the PSU and area segment [5].

The 1994 Panel consists of all respondents for whom a complete interview was obtained in the 1992 NES Cross-section sample. 1005 1992 cross-section interview HUs make up the 1994 Panel.

**Fourth Stage Respondent Selection**

Within each sampled new cross-section housing unit, the SRC interviewer prepared a complete listing of all eligible household members. Using an objective procedure described by Kish (1949) [6] a single respondent was then selected at random to be interviewed. Regardless of circumstances, no substitutions were permitted for the designated respondent. This technique had also been used in 1992 to select the original Panel respondents. In 1994 the same Panel respondent (R) was sought for interview as had been interviewed in 1992.

**SAMPLE DESIGN SPECIFICATIONS**

The targeted completed interview sample size for the 1994 NES Post-Election Survey was \( n = 1,750 \) total cases. In the original sample size computation, the following assumptions were made for the cross-section component of the sample: response rate for post-election interview = .74, combined occupancy/eligibility rate = .83 and change from updating the sample HU listings = 1.02. The updating was to include only "Type II" updating, i.e., only changes found at selected lines at the time of interviewing; no pre-study update was felt to be necessary due to the fact that most of the selected segments had been used and updated recently on other SRC studies (Health and Retirement Survey and the Asset and Health Dynamics Survey). The assumption as to occupancy/eligibility rate was derived from survey experience in the 1986 NES Post Election Survey [7] and that regarding response rate was based on the 1992 cross-section component outcome for the pre-election interview [8]. The assumptions made for the panel component were: .915 recontact rate based on the .923 recontact rate in the 1993 NES Pilot Study for 1992 cross-section respondents (i.e., same respondents as the current 1994 Panel),
.691 response rate for the post-election interview based on NES experience from 1990-1992 in recontacting respondents three times over a two year period, and at .975 change from the update assuming some loss of HUs among panel respondents and inability to track the respondent to a new address.

Table 3 provides a full description of the original sample design specifications. Table 4 shows those specifications and assumptions applied to the actual selected Cross-section component of the 1994 NES Sample and also indicates the number of HU listings assigned to each replicate.

Table 3: Original Sample Design Specifications and Assumptions 1994 National Post-Election Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cross-Section Component</th>
<th>Panel Component</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed Post interviews</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>1,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Rate</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.691</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible sample households</td>
<td>1,527</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>2,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy/Eligibility Rate[9]</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel Recontact Rate</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>.915</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Units</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>3,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change from Update</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample lines</td>
<td>1,804</td>
<td>1,005</td>
<td>2,809</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 4: Original Sample Design Specifications and Assumptions Applied to the Selected Cross-Section Sample Lines for the 1994 National Post-Election Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reserve Sample</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Rep 1</td>
<td>Rep 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Interviews</td>
<td>1,097</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Rate</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated Respondents</td>
<td>1,482</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy/ Elig Rate[10]</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Units</td>
<td>1,783</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change from Update</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample lines</td>
<td>1,751</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 compares the original sample design specifications and assumptions for the new Cross-Section Component of the 1994 NES (as in Table 3) applied to the released cross-section sample (Replicate 1) to the outcome for the final Cross-Section sample. Table 6 makes a similar comparison for the Panel Component of the 1994 NES Sample and Table 7 presents a summary of the figures for the combined Cross-Section/Panel Sample.

Table 5: Original Sample Design Specifications and Assumptions and Actual Sample Design Outcomes for the Cross-Section Component of the 1994 National Post-Election Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Specifications &amp; Assumptions Applied to: Actual Release (Replicate 1)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed Interviews</td>
<td>1,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Rate</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated Respondents</td>
<td>1,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy/Eligibility Rate</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample HU listings</td>
<td>1,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample growth from update[12]</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected Sample lines</td>
<td>1,751</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the daily monitoring of field results, on November 21, 1994 NES study staff decided that it would be a better use of study resources to raise the cross-section response rate rather than to release additional cross-section sample which might have had the effect of further reducing the response rate. Therefore no reserve replicates of the cross-section sample were released.

Table 6 /s shows the panel component sample outcome for the 1994 NES Post-Election Survey. Of course, in this component all sample lines were released; no reserve replicates were designated to be withheld. Due to extremely conservative original assumptions, the actual number of interviews obtained exceeded even the most optimistic projection by nearly 60 interviews. This has more than made up for the fewer than anticipated cross-section interviews which can be seen in Table 7, where entire 1994 NES sample design projections are compared with the combined sample outcome.

Table 6: Original Sample Design Specifications and Assumptions and Actual Sample Design Outcomes for the Panel Component of the 1994 National Post-Election Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Specifications</th>
<th>Actual Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page 101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
& Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed Interviews</th>
<th>620[13]</th>
<th>759</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response Rate</td>
<td>.691[14]</td>
<td>.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs with Eligible Resp</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel Recontact Rate</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td>.981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Units</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>1,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change from update</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Panel Cases</td>
<td>1,005</td>
<td>1,005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Figures for Original Sample Design Specifications and Assumptions and Actual Sample Design Outcomes for the Combined Cross-Section/Panel Sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Specifications</th>
<th>Actual Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed Interviews</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>1,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Response Rate</td>
<td>.722</td>
<td>.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible Sample HH</td>
<td>2,424</td>
<td>2,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occ/Elig/Recontact Rate</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample HU listings</td>
<td>2,820</td>
<td>2,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Change from update</td>
<td>1.004</td>
<td>1.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected Sample lines</td>
<td>2,809</td>
<td>2,756</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WEIGHTED ANALYSIS OF 1994 NES DATA

The area probability sample design for the 1994 NES results in an equal probability sample of U.S. households. However, within sample households a single adult respondent is chosen at random to be interviewed. Since the number of eligible adults may vary from one household to another, the random selection of a single adult introduces inequality into respondents' selection probabilities. In analysis, a respondent selection weight should be used to compensate for these unequal selection probabilities. The value of the respondent selection weight is exactly equal to the number of eligible adults in the household from which the random respondent was selected. The use of the respondent selection weight is strongly encouraged, despite past evaluations which have shown these weights to have little significant impact on the values of NES estimates of descriptive statistics.

The Sampling Section has provided two final person-level analysis weights which incorporate sampling, nonresponse and post-stratification factors. One weight variable (#5) is for use with Panel cases only; the other weight variable (#4) is for the 1994 NES Cross-section (which includes both panel and new cross-section cases.) In addition, a Time Series Weight (variable #6) which corrects for panel attrition was constructed. This weight should be used in analyses which compare the 1994 NES to earlier unweighted National Election Study data collections. Analysts interested in developing their own...
nonresponse or post-stratification adjustment factors must request access to the necessary sample control data from the NES Board.

CONSTRUCTION OF ANALYSIS WEIGHTS

Nonresponse adjustment factors were constructed at the household level separately for Panel and new Cross-Section component cases. Nonresponse adjustment cells were formed by crossing PSU type (Self-representing, Nonself-representing MSA or non-MSA) by the nine Census divisions (New England, Middle Atlantic, East North Central, West North Central, South Atlantic, East South Central, West South Central, Mountain, and Pacific). A nonresponse factor equal to the inverse of the response rate in each cell was applied to the interview cases. In order to have a minimum of approximately 25 cases in each nonresponse adjustment cell, some cells were collapsed across Census Divisions in the same Census Region. Tables 8 and 9 show the nonresponse adjustment factors for the Panel and for new cross section respectively.

An intermediate weight was constructed by multiplying the reciprocal of the probability of selection of the household by the nonresponse adjustment factor and by the number of eligible persons in the household [15]. This intermediate weight was used to produce a weighted sex by age category by Census Region table. The age categories used were: 18-44, 45-64, and 65+. Post-stratification factors were constructed to match the sample proportions in the 24 sex by age by Region cells to the July 1993 Census population projections (Current Population Reports, P25-1111, Table 4). Table 10 shows the post-stratification factors for the 1994 NES Panel. Table 11 shows the post-stratification factors for the complete cross-section (both panel and new cross section cases.) The two final analysis weights were each centered to a mean of 1.0 so that the sum of the weights equals the number of respondents.

CONSTRUCTION OF TIME SERIES WEIGHT

The 1994 NES Panel consists of 759 respondents originally selected for the 1992 Pre-Election Study. Of 1,126 1992 Pre-Election respondents, 1,005 were also respondents on the 1992 Post-Election Study. All 1,005 1992 Post-Election respondents were eligible for the 1994 NES Panel. In order to adjust for panel attrition, a Time Series Weight was constructed which adjusts the proportions for 30 demographic cells: Education (3) by Age Group (5) by Years of Residence (2) to the 1992 proportions. New 1994 cross-section cases have a Time Series weight of 1.0. In forming the panel attrition weight cells, the following definitions were used:

Age Group: 17-24, 25-39, 40-64, 65-74, 75 or more.
Education: Less than high school graduate, high school graduate, more than high school education.

Years of Residence: Less than 3 years at current residence, 3 or more years at current residence.

Table 8
Computation of Nonresponse Adjustment Weights -- Panel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSU Type</th>
<th>Census Region</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>Nonresponse Adjustment Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSU Type</th>
<th>Census Region</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR-MSA</td>
<td>Middle Atlantic</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>1.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East North Central</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>1.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West North Central</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>1.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>1.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West South Central</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>1.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSR-MSA</td>
<td>New England &amp;</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>1.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Atlantic</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>1.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East North Central</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>1.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West North Central</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>1.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>1.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East South Central &amp;</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>1.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West South Central</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>1.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>1.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>1.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSR-non MSA</td>
<td>New England &amp;</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>1.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Atlantic</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>1.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East North Central &amp;</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>1.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West North Central</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>1.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>1.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East South Central &amp;</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>1.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West South Central</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>1.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mountain &amp; Pacific</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9
Computation of Nonresponse Adjustment Weights -- New Cross Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSU Type</th>
<th>Census Region</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR-MSA</td>
<td>New England &amp; Middle Atlantic</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>1.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East North Central</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>1.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West North Central</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>1.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>1.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>2.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSR-MSA</td>
<td>New England</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>2.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Atlantic</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>1.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East North Central</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>1.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West North Central</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>1.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>1.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East South Central</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>1.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West South Central</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>1.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>1.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>1.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSR-non MSA</td>
<td>New England &amp; Middle Atlantic</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>1.379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East North Central &amp; West North Central</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>1.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>1.382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East South Central &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Census Est.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>18-44</td>
<td>10,652,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>4,867,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>2,815,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>18-44</td>
<td>12,679,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>5,626,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>3,211,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td>18-44</td>
<td>18,797,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>8,177,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>4,574,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>18-44</td>
<td>12,611,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>4,908,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>2,580,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>18-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>5,338,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>4,329,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>18-44</td>
<td>12,783,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>5,990,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>4,789,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td>18-44</td>
<td>18,950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>8,882,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>6,753,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>18-44</td>
<td>11,979,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>5,077,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>3,543,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>190,754,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Census Est.</th>
<th>94 Nat'l</th>
<th>Post-Strat. Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>18-44</td>
<td>10,652,000</td>
<td>7,780,520</td>
<td>1.3691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>4,867,000</td>
<td>3,562,080</td>
<td>1.3663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>2,815,000</td>
<td>2,880,870</td>
<td>1.0025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>18-44</td>
<td>12,679,000</td>
<td>13,282,300</td>
<td>0.9546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>5,626,000</td>
<td>6,435,320</td>
<td>0.8742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>3,211,000</td>
<td>3,211,000</td>
<td>0.8091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td>18-44</td>
<td>18,797,000</td>
<td>16,523,490</td>
<td>1.1376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>8,177,000</td>
<td>8,230,300</td>
<td>0.9935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>4,574,000</td>
<td>4,027,460</td>
<td>1.1368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>18-44</td>
<td>12,611,000</td>
<td>12,611,000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>4,908,000</td>
<td>3,867,010</td>
<td>1.2692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>2,580,000</td>
<td>2,414,850</td>
<td>1.0684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>18-44</td>
<td>10,844,000</td>
<td>8,160,800</td>
<td>1.3288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>5,338,000</td>
<td>3,776,480</td>
<td>1.4135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>4,329,000</td>
<td>4,027,800</td>
<td>1.0748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>18-44</td>
<td>12,783,000</td>
<td>11,222,760</td>
<td>1.1390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to obtain a minimum of approximately 15 cases per cell, some of the cells were collapsed across age groups. Table 12 shows the panel attrition factors for the 25 Years in Residence by Education Level by Age Group cells.

Table 12
Panel Attrition (Time Series) Weight Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Residence</th>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Panel Attrition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 3</td>
<td>&lt; HS Graduate</td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>1.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>1.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; HS Grad, HS Grad</td>
<td>17-24</td>
<td>1.428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS Graduate</td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>1.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>1.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS Graduate</td>
<td>17-24</td>
<td>1.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>1.376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>1.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+</td>
<td>&lt; HS Grad</td>
<td>17-39</td>
<td>1.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40-64</td>
<td>1.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>1.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75+</td>
<td>2.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS Graduate</td>
<td>17-24</td>
<td>1.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>1.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40-64</td>
<td>1.443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>1.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75+</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; HS Graduate</td>
<td>17-24</td>
<td>1.417</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>1.354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-64</td>
<td>1.564</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>1.269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75+</td>
<td>1.769</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROCEDURES FOR SAMPLING ERROR ESTIMATION

The 1994 NES is based on a stratified multi-stage area probability sample of United States households. Although smaller in scale, the NES sample design is very similar in its basic structure to the multi-stage designs used for major federal survey programs such as the Health Interview Survey (HIS) or the Current Population Survey (CPS). The survey literature refers to the NES, HIS and CPS samples as complex designs, a loosely-used term meant to denote the fact that the sample incorporates special design features such as stratification, clustering and differential selection probabilities (i.e., weighting) that analysts must consider in computing sampling errors for sample estimates of descriptive statistics and model parameters. This section of the 1994 NES sample design description focuses on sampling error estimation and construction of confidence intervals for survey estimates of descriptive statistics such as means, proportions, ratios, and coefficients for linear and logistic linear regression models.
Standard analysis software systems such as SAS, SPSS, OSIRIS assume simple random sampling (SRS) or equivalently independence of observations in computing standard errors for sample estimates. In general, the SRS assumption results in underestimation of variances of survey estimates of descriptive statistics and model parameters. Confidence intervals based on computed variances that assume independence of observations will be biased (generally too narrow) and design-based inferences will be affected accordingly.

Sampling Error Computation Methods and Programs

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

1. Linearization Approach

If data are collected using a complex sample design with unequal size clusters, most statistics of interest will not be simple linear functions of the observed data. The objective of the linearization approach is to apply Taylor's method to derive an approximate form of the estimator that is linear in statistics for which variances and covariances can be directly estimated. Kish, 1965; Woodruff, 1971). Linearized variance approximations are derived for estimators of ratio means (Kish and Hess, 1959); finite population regression coefficients and correlation coefficients (Kish and Frankel, 1974); and many other non-linear statistics. Software packages such as SUDAAN and PC CARP (see below) use the Taylor Series linearization method to estimate standard errors for the coefficients of logistic regression models. In these programs, an iteratively reweighted least squares algorithm is used to compute maximum likelihood estimates of model parameters. At each step of the model fitting algorithm, a Taylor Series linearization approach is used to compute the variance/covariance matrix for the current iteration's parameter estimates (Binder, 1983).

Available sampling error computation software that utilizes the Taylor Series linearization method includes: SUDAAN and PC SUDAAN, SUPERCARP AND PC CARP, CLUSTERS, OSIRIS PSALMS, OSIRIS PSRATIO, and OSIRIS PSTABLES. PC SUDAAN and PC CARP include procedures for estimation of sampling error both for descriptive statistics such as means, proportion, totals and for parameters of commonly used multivariate models (least squares regression, logistic regression).

2. Resampling Approaches

In the mid-1940's, P.C. Mahalanobis (1946) outlined a simple replicated procedure for selecting probability samples that permits simple, unbiased estimation of variances. The practical difficulty with the simple replicated approach to design and variance estimation is that many replicates are needed to achieve stability of the variance estimator. Unfortunately, a design with many independent replicates must utilize a coarser stratification than
alternative designs—to achieve stable variance estimates, sample precision must be sacrificed. Balanced Repeated Replication (BRR), Jackknife Repeated Replication (JRR) and the Bootstrap are alternative replication techniques that may be used for estimating sampling errors for statistics based on complex sample data.

The BRR method is applicable to stratified designs in which two half-sample units (i.e., PSUs) are selected from each design stratum. The conventional "two PSU-per-stratum" design is the best theoretical example of such a design although in practice, collapsing of strata (Kalton, 1977) and random combination of units within strata are employed to restructure a sample design for BRR variance estimation. The half-sample codes prepared for the 1994 NES data set require the collapsing of nonself-representing strata and the randomized combination of selection units within self-representing (SR) strata. When full balancing of the half-sample assignments is employed (Wolter, 1985), BRR is the most computationally efficient of the replicated variance estimation techniques. The number of general purpose BRR sampling error estimation programs in the public domain is limited. The OSIRIS REPERR program includes the option for BRR estimation of sampling errors for least squares regression coefficients and correlation statistics. Research organizations such as Westat, Inc. and the National Center for Health Statistics have developed general purpose programs for BRR estimation of standard errors. Another option is to use SAS or SPSS Macro facilities to implement the relatively simple BRR algorithm. The necessary computation formulas and Hadamard matrices to define the half-sample replicates are available in Wolter (1985).

With improvements in computational flexibility and speed, jackknife (JRR) and bootstrap methods for sampling error estimation and inference have become more common (Rao and Wu, 1988). Few general purpose programs for jackknife estimation of variances are available to analysts. OSIRIS REPERR has a JRR module for estimation of standard errors for regression and correlation statistics. Other stand alone programs may also be available in the general survey research community. Like BRR, the algorithm for JRR is relatively easy to program using SAS, SPSS or S-Plus macro facilities.

BRR and JRR are variance estimation techniques, each designed to minimize the number of "resamplings" needed to compute the variance estimate. In theory, the bootstrap is not simply a tool for variance estimation but an approach to actual inference for statistics. In practice, the bootstrap is implemented by resampling (with replacement) from the observed sample units. To ensure that the full complexity of the design is reflected, the selection of each bootstrap reflects the full complexity of the stratification, clustering and weighting that is present in the original sample design. A large number of bootstrap samples are selected and the statistic of interest is computed for each. The empirical distribution of the estimate that results from the large set of bootstrap samples can then be used to a variance estimate and a support interval for inference about the population statistic of interest.

In most practical survey analysis problems, the JRR and Bootstrap methods should yield similar results. Most survey analysts should choose JRR due to its computational efficiency. NES data analysts interested in the bootstrap technique are referred to LePage and Billard (1992) for additional reading and a bibliography for the general literature on this topic.

One aspect of BRR, JRR and bootstrap variance estimation that is often pushed aside in practice is the treatment of analysis weights. In theory, when a resampling occurs (i.e., a BRR half sample is formed), the analysis weights should be recomputed based only on the selection probabilities, nonresponse...
Regardless of whether linearization or a resampling approach is used, estimation of variances for complex sample survey estimates requires the specification of a sampling error computation model. NES data analysts who are interested in performing sampling error computations should be aware that the estimation programs identified in the preceding section assume a specific sampling error computation model and will require special sampling error codes. Individual records in the analysis data set must be assigned sampling error codes which identify to the programs the complex structure of the sample (stratification, clustering) and are compatible with the computation algorithms of the various programs. To facilitate the computation of sampling error for statistics based on 1994 NES data, design-specific sampling error codes will be routinely included in all public-use versions of the data set. Although minor recoding may be required to conform to the input requirements of the individual programs, the sampling error codes that are provided should enable analysts to conduct either Taylor Series or Replicated estimation of sampling errors for survey statistics.

Table 13 defines the sampling error coding system for 1994 NES sample cases. Two sampling error code variables are defined for each case based on the sample design primary stage unit (PSU) and area segment in which the sample household is located.

Sampling Error Stratum Code (Variable #63). The Sampling Error Computation Stratum Code is the variable which defines the sampling error computation strata for all sampling error analysis of the NES data. With the exception of the New York, Los Angeles and Chicago MSAs, each self-representing (SR) design stratum is represented by one sampling error computation stratum. Due to their population size, two sampling error computation strata are defined for each of the three largest MSAs. Pairs of similar nonself-representing (NSR) primary stage design strata are "collapsed" (Kalton, 1977) to create NSR sampling error computation strata.

The SRC National Sample design uses Controlled selection and a "one-per-stratum" PSU allocation are used to select the primary stage of the 1994 NES national sample. The purpose in using Controlled Selection and the "one-per-stratum" sample allocation is to reduce the between-PSU component of sampling variation relative to a "two-per-stratum" primary stage design. Despite the expected improvement in sample precision, a drawback of the "one-per-stratum" design is that two or more sample selection strata must be collapsed or combined to form a sampling error computation stratum. Variances are then estimated under the assumption that a multiple PSU per stratum design was actually used for primary stage selection. The expected consequence of collapsing design strata into sampling error computation strata is the overestimation of the true sampling error; that is, the sampling error computation model defined by the codes contained in Table 13 will yield estimates of sampling errors which in expectation will be slightly greater than the true sampling error of the statistic of interest.

SECU - Stratum-specific Sampling Error Computation Unit code (Variable #64) is a half sample code for analysis of sampling error using the BRR method or approximate "two-per-stratum" Taylor Series method (Kish and Hess, 1959). Within the SR sampling error strata, the SECU half sample units are created by
dividing sample cases into random halves, SECU=1 and SECU=2. The assignment of cases to half-samples is designed to preserve the stratification and second stage clustering properties of the sample within an SR stratum. Sample cases are assigned to SECU half samples based on the area segment in which they were selected. For this assignment, sample cases were placed in original stratification order (area segment number order) and beginning with a random start entire area segment clusters were systematically assigned to either SECU=1 or SECU=2.

In the general case of nonself-representing (NSR) strata, the half sample units are defined according to the PSU to which the respondent was assigned at sample selection. That is, the half samples for each NSR sampling error computation stratum bear a one-to-one correspondence to the sample design NSR PSUs.

The particular sample coding provided on the NES public use data set is consistent with the "ultimate cluster" approach to complex sample variance estimation (Kish, 1965; Kalton, 1977). Individual stratum, PSU and segment code variables may be needed by NES analysts interested in components of variance analysis or estimation of hierarchical models in which PSU-level and neighborhood-level effects are explicitly estimated.

Table 13 shows the sampling error stratum and SECU codes to be used for the paired selection model for sampling error computations for any 1994 NES analyses; the same codes can be used when using the combined cross-section/panel data or when using either panel or cross-section data separately. The 42 strata reflect the two-thirds National Sample design used in 1994. It can be seen from this table that the three-digit 1994 SE code is comprised of: first the two-digit SE Stratum code followed by the one-digit SECU code.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sampling Error SECU Code</th>
<th>PSU Number</th>
<th>Segment Numbers</th>
<th>Segment Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stratum Code (Half Sample)</td>
<td>Cross-Section</td>
<td>Panel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>103 119 135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>107 123 139</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>111 127 143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>115 131 148</td>
<td>131 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>110 123 136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>101 114 126</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>104 117 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>107 120 133</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>112 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>117 134</td>
<td>117 134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>103 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>107 125</td>
<td>107 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>102 110 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>106 113 121</td>
<td>106 113 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>105 112 119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>101 108 115</td>
<td>101 108 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>104 110 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>101 107 113</td>
<td>107 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>105 111 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Value 1</td>
<td>Value 2</td>
<td>Value 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To assist NES analysts, the OSIRIS PSALMS program was used to compute sampling errors for a wide-ranging example set of means and proportions estimated from the 1988 NES Pre-election Survey data set [16]. For each estimate, sampling errors were computed for the total sample and for twenty demographic and...
The results of these sampling error computations were then summarized and translated into the general usage sampling error table provided in Table 14.

Incorporating the pattern of "design effects" observed in the extensive set of example computations, Table 14 provides approximate standard errors for percentage estimates based on the 1988 NES. To use the table, examine the column heading to find the percentage value which best approximates the value of the estimated percentage that is of interest [17]. Next, locate the approximate sample size base (denominator for the proportion) in the left-hand row margin of the table. To find the approximate standard error of a percentage estimate, simply cross-reference the appropriate column (percentage) and row (sample size base). Note: the tabulated values represent approximately one standard error for the percentage estimate. To construct an approximate confidence interval, the analyst should apply the appropriate critical point from the "z" distribution (e.g., z=1.96 for a two-sided 95% confidence interval half-width). Furthermore, the approximate standard errors in the table apply only to single point estimates of percentages not to the difference between two percentage estimates.

The generalized variance results presented in Table 14 are a useful tool for initial, cursory examination of the NES survey results. For more in depth analysis and reporting of critical estimates, analysts are encouraged to compute exact estimates of standard errors using the appropriate choice of a sampling error program and computation model.

**Table 14: Generalized Variance Table.**

**1994 NES Post-Election Survey.**

**APPROXIMATE STANDARD ERRORS FOR PERCENTAGES**

For percentage estimates near:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample n</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>10% or 60%</th>
<th>10% or 70%</th>
<th>10% or 80%</th>
<th>10% or 90%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>5.406</td>
<td>5.297</td>
<td>4.955</td>
<td>4.325</td>
<td>3.244</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.853</td>
<td>3.775</td>
<td>3.531</td>
<td>3.082</td>
<td>2.312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>3.170</td>
<td>3.106</td>
<td>2.905</td>
<td>2.536</td>
<td>1.902</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>2.766</td>
<td>2.710</td>
<td>2.535</td>
<td>2.123</td>
<td>1.660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>2.492</td>
<td>2.442</td>
<td>2.284</td>
<td>1.994</td>
<td>1.495</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750</td>
<td>2.072</td>
<td>2.030</td>
<td>1.899</td>
<td>1.658</td>
<td>1.433</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1.826</td>
<td>1.789</td>
<td>1.674</td>
<td>1.461</td>
<td>1.096</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250</td>
<td>1.661</td>
<td>1.628</td>
<td>1.523</td>
<td>1.329</td>
<td>0.997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1.542</td>
<td>1.511</td>
<td>1.413</td>
<td>1.233</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1.434</td>
<td>1.405</td>
<td>1.315</td>
<td>1.147</td>
<td>0.861</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The approximate standard error of the percentage is:

**References**


NOTES
[1] The Panel consists of all 1005 Respondents from the 1992 NES study Cross-Section sample. Of these, 925 were recontacted in the 1993 NES Pilot Study (a follow-up of the 1992 NES survey), of which 750 were re-interviewed, 98 refused to be re-interviewed and 77 could not be re-interviewed at that time due to some 'permanent' condition. 80 of the 1005 1992 Cross-section respondents could not be found for re-interview in 1993.

[2] Analysis of pooled data from respondents from both components of the 1994 NES sample requires a strong assumption about the nature of the attrition of the 1992 cross-section sample. It must be assumed that panel attrition is not correlated with variables under consideration in the analysis.

[3] Non-MSA segments were selected from the 1980 Census summary tape file series STF1B file, with minimum SSU size of 50 occupied H.U.s.

[4] The number of segments shown for the 1994 Panel is the expected count; it is based on the number of 1992 Cross-Section segments. It is possible that some of these 1992 segments yielded no 1992 interviews and so do not actually show up in the 1994 Panel. The total number of segments shown for the 1994 Cross-section sample also includes three segments from which no listed HU was selected for the 1994 cross-section, due to few or no HU listings for that segment. Where different, the actual number of segments having selections in 1994 is shown in parentheses to the left.


The 1986 NES was the most recent NES sample using the two-thirds National Sample without alteration (e.g., increasing number of segments in the B1 areas as in 1992). Occupancy/eligibility rate was .835.

The response rate in 1986 had been unusually low, and it was felt that the more recent experience in the two-thirds partition PSUs would be the best estimate--less affected than occupancy/eligibility rate by the increased number of segments in B1 areas.

Based on field experience in 1986 NES study. To most closely tailor the field effort to the sample field experience during this study, the cross-section sample had four replicates designated (see Table 4). Each replicate is a proper subsample of the NES sample. Replicate 1, considered the "base sample", was to be released for interviewing to begin November 9, 1994, the day following Election Day 1994. The other three replicates of the cross-section sample (Replicates 2-4) were designated "Reserve" replicates, none, one or more to be released for field work no later than November 21, 1994 at the discretion of NES study staff based on daily monitoring of field results from Release 1. Reserve replicates 2-4 of the cross-section component of the NES sample were never, in fact, released for field work.

A subsampling of one-third of selected addresses was made in certain cases when selected lines were determined to be within locked buildings, in gated subdivisions or in areas which posed a danger to interviewing staff. This allowed concentration of greater field effort in these circumstances to obtain at least some interviews. In cases where this was done, appropriate weighting of the results will be used to compensate. (See Table 5.)

One percent of the released sample was lost due to subsampling in three locked and dangerous segment areas; 17 of the 20 selected lines excluded from these six segments were in replicate 1. These lines were assigned a result code of '75' and considered 'Non-Sample' lines.

Since only the Type II updating process was applied to the cross-section component of the 1994 NES Sample, the update inflation factor was set at 1.02 -- slightly lower than the usual factor of 1.03 typical of combined Type I (pre-study) and Type II updating inflation applied to the National Sample.

Actually the projection ranged from 620-700 completed interviews. See comments in following footnote.

An overall Panel response rate of 69.1% was assumed, based on previous recontact experience (response rate of 1990 Pilot Study respondents to the 1992 NES Pre-Election Study follow-up): 750 cases were interviewed twice previously at 76.6% response rate = 575 cases, and 255 other cases combined 17.6% response rate = 45 cases. Removing the change from update and recontact rate (1005 - 25 - 83 = 897), overall response rate: 620/897 = .691. This was admittedly a very conservative estimate and actual projection of expected number of interviews was a range of 620-700.

In constructing the analysis weight, a maximum of three eligible adults was allowed

The design effects from the 1988 NES are expected to be similar to those for the 1994 NES. Sampling errors for the 1994 NES have not been run.
The standard error of a percentage is a systematic function with its maximum centered at 50%; i.e., the standard error of p=40% and p=60% estimates are equal. 

SAMPLE DESIGN 1996 ELECTION STUDY

STUDY POPULATION

The study population for the 1996 National Pre/Post-Election Study (NES) is defined to include all United States citizens of voting age on or before the 1996 Election Day. Eligible citizens must have resided in housing units in the forty-eight coterminous states. This definition excludes persons living in Alaska or Hawaii and requires eligible persons to have been both a United States citizen and eighteen years of age on or before the 5th of November 1996.

MULTI-STAGE AREA PROBABILITY SAMPLE DESIGN

The 1996 NES is based on a multi-stage area probability sample selected from the Survey Research Center's (SRC) National Sample design. Identification of the 1996 NES sample respondents was conducted using a four stage sampling process--a primary stage sampling of U.S. Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) or New England County Metropolitan Areas (NECMAs)[1] and counties, followed by a second stage sampling of area segments, a third stage sampling of housing units within sampled area segments and concluding with the random selection of a single respondent from selected housing units. A detailed documentation of the 1980 SRC National Sample, from which the 1996 NES Panel was originally drawn is provided in the SRC publication titled 1980 SRC National Sample: Design and Development. A detailed documentation of the 1990 SRC National Sample, from which the 1996 NES Cross-section supplement was drawn, is provided in the SRC publication titled 1990 SRC National Sample: Design and Development.

The 1996 NES sample design called for a 1996 NES Panel component consisting of all respondents to the 1994 NES study, originally drawn from the 1980 SRC National Sample, and a 1996 NES Cross-section component drawn from the 1990 SRC National Sample. Although both of these SRC National Samples are multi-stage area probability samples as described above, there are differences in specific details at the various stages of the two SRC National Samples which will be described below.

Figure 1 shows in schematic detail the original sources of the components of the 1996 NES Sample. On this figure the "n" indicated in the 1992 and 1994 boxes is actually the number of Respondents from that year and component that became the Panel component two years later. Of course the "n" shown for the 1996 NES Panel and Cross-section components does not refer to 1996 Respondents but, for the 1996 Panel, to the total number of sample eligible households (i.e. the total of the Respondents from both components of 1994) and, for the Cross-section supplement, to the total selected number of listed housing units used in the 1996 NES.

Figure 1: Source of 1996 NES Sample Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1980 SRC National Sample</th>
<th>1990 SRC National Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992 NES Cross-section</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=1,005)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Selection Stages for the 1996 NES Panel Component: 1980 SRC National Sample

### Primary Stage Selection: 1996 NES Panel Component

The selection of primary stage sampling units (PSUs), which depending on the sample stratum are either MSAs, single counties or groupings of small counties, is based on the county-level 1980 Census Reports of Population and Housing. Primary stage units were assigned to 84 explicit strata based on MSA/non-MSA status, PSU size, and geographic location. Sixteen of the 84 strata contain only a single self-representing PSU, each of which is included with certainty in the primary stage of sample selection. The remaining 68 nonself-representing strata contain more than one PSU. From each of these nonself-representing strata, one PSU was sampled with probability proportionate to its size (PPS) measured in 1980 occupied housing units.

The full SRC National Sample of 84 primary stage selections was designed to be optimal for surveys roughly two to three times the size of the 1994 NES. To permit the flexibility needed for optimal design of smaller survey samples, the primary stage of the SRC National Sample can be readily partitioned into smaller subsamples of PSUs such as a one-half sample or two-thirds sample partition. Each of the partitions represents a stratified subsampling from the full 84 PSU design. The one-half partition of the 1980 National Sample (i.e., the "A" primary sampling units or PSUs) includes 11 of the 16 self-representing MSA PSUs and a stratified subsampling of 34 of the 68 nonself-representing PSUs of the SRC National Sample. The two-thirds partition includes all of the "A" PSUs plus "B1" PSUs, i.e., 5 additional self-representing PSUs and 11 additional nonself-representing PSUs.

Since the 1994 NES desired comparison of data over time from 1992 NES respondents, as well as a representative sample of eligible 1994 respondents, the 1994 NES sample design included both a Panel and a Cross-section component. The Panel component of the 1994 design consisted of all respondents from the NES Cross-section component of the 1992 NES sample. The 1994 NES Cross-section component was a new selection of respondents from an area probability sample of households taken from the two-thirds partition of the SRC National Sample. The Panel component of the 1996 NES sample consists of all 1994 respondents from both of these 1994 NES components. See Figure 1.

Due to sample design decisions in 1992, when the NES sample moved from using the one-half sample partition to the two-thirds sample partition of the SRC National Sample, the Cross-section portion of the 1992 NES sample included a disproportionate number of selections from segments in "B1" PSUs (see Table 1). This same disproportionate distribution was, of course, reflected in the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Panel</td>
<td>n=759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cross-section</td>
<td>n=1,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Panel</td>
<td>n=1,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cross-section</td>
<td>(n=803)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both 1980 &amp; 1990 National Samples</td>
<td>(n=2,598)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Panel component of the 1994 NES sample and, thus carried to the 1996 NES Panel. While this led to some statistical inefficiency in the form of increased variance of survey estimates relative to that of an even distribution across the two-thirds partition primary areas, since the "BI" PSU areas do represent a proper subsample of the 1980 National Sample design, separate longitudinal analysis of the 1996 NES Panel (i.e., analysis of combined 1994 Panel and 1994 Cross-section data)[5] can be undertaken.

Table 1 identifies the PSUs for the Panel component of the 1996 National Election Study by MSA status and Region. The "B1" PSUs in the Panel portion of the sample design which received the disproportionate allocation in 1992 to supplement the half-sample are also indicated on this table as well as the number of area segments carried over to the 1996 NES Panel component (see next section); all PSUs on this table are proportionately represented in the 1994 NES two-thirds Cross-section Sample.

Second Stage Selection of Area Segments: 1996 NES Panel Component

The second stage of the 1994 NES National Sample was selected directly from computerized files that were prepared from the 1990 Census file (PL94-171 file on CD Rom) which contains the block-level 1990 Census total housing unit (HU) data. The designated second-stage sampling units (SSUs), termed "area segments", are comprised of census blocks in the metropolitan (MSA) primary areas and either census blocks or enumeration districts (EDs) in the rural areas of non-MSA primary areas. Each SSU block, block combination or enumeration district for non-MSA PSUs was assigned a measure of size equal to the total 1980 occupied housing unit count for the area. MSA SSU block(s) were assigned a minimum measure of 72 1990 total HUs per SSU; non-MSA SSU blocks were assigned a minimum measure of 50 1980 occupied HUs per SSU. Second stage sampling of area segments was performed with probabilities proportionate to the assigned measures of size (PPS).

A three-step process of ordering the SSUs within the primary areas produced an implicit stratification of the area segments in the second stage sampling frame, stratified at the county level by geographic location and population. Area segments were stratified within county at the Minor Civil Division (MCD) level by size and income, and at the block and ED level by location within the MCD or county. (For details, refer to the SRC publication, 1980 National Sample: Design and Development.)

For the 1994 NES combined Panel/Cross-section sample the number of area segments used in each PSU varied. In the self-representing (SR) PSUs the number of sample area segments varied in proportion to the size of the primary stage unit, from a high of 12 Cross-section and 7 Panel area segments in the self-representing New York MSA, to a low of 4 Cross-section and no Panel area segments in the smaller self-representing PSUs such as Pittsburgh and Boston MSAs. Most Nonself-representing (NSR) PSUs were represented by 6 Cross-section and 2 Panel area segments except for "B1" PSUs for which there are either 5 or 6 Panel segments. A total of 554 area segments were selected for the 1994 NES, 191 Panel and 363 Cross-section segments, 157 in the sixteen self-representing PSUs and 397 in the nonself-representing PSUs as shown in the last column of Table 1.

In most cases, both 1994 NES Cross-section and 1994 NES Panel selections were made from the same area segments within each PSU, so in actual fact a total of 376 distinct 1980 National Sample area segments were used for the 1994 NES Post-election Study. Of these, 364 segments had respondents in 1994 and were carried over to the Panel component of the 1996 NES Study.
Table 1: PSU Name and Number[7] of Panel Area Segments in the 1996 NES Sample
Showing 1980 SRC National-Sample Stratum, Partition and MSA Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Sample</th>
<th>National Sample</th>
<th># of 1996 NES Panel Segments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSU Number and Partition</td>
<td>PSU Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Six Largest Self-representing PSUs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSU Number</th>
<th>Partition</th>
<th>PSU Name</th>
<th># of Panel Segments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>501</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>New York, NY-NJ</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Philadelphia, PA-NJ</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ten Remaining Self-representing PSUs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSU Number</th>
<th>Partition</th>
<th>PSU Name</th>
<th># of Panel Segments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>507</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Washington, DC-MD-VA</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Dallas-Ft Worth, TX</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Nassau-Suffolk, NY</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>St Louis, MO-IL</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Pittsburgh, PA</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>514</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Baltimore, MD</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Minneapolis, MN-WI</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nonself-representing MSAs: Northeast**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSU Number</th>
<th>Partition</th>
<th>PSU Name</th>
<th># of Panel Segments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>517</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Buffalo, NY</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Newark, NJ</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>New Haven, CT</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Atlantic City, NJ</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Manchester, NH</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nonself-representing MSAs: Midwest (North Central in 1980 Census)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSU Number</th>
<th>Partition</th>
<th>PSU Name</th>
<th># of Panel Segments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>526</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Milwaukee, WI</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Dayton, OH</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Kansas City, MO-KS</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Des Moines, IA</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Grand Rapids, MI</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Fort Wayne, IN</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>533</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Steubenville, OH-WV</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>534</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Saginaw, MI</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nonself-representing MSAs: South**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSU Number</th>
<th>Partition</th>
<th>PSU Name</th>
<th># of Panel Segments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>536</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Birmingham, AL</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>539</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Columbus, GA-AL</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Miami, FL</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>542</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Jacksonville, FL</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>543</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Lakeland, FL</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>McAllen, TX</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Waco, TX</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nonself-representing MSAs:  West

553   A         Seattle, WA                      6
554   A         Denver, CO                       6
556   A         Anaheim, CA                      5
557   B1        Riverside-San Bernarndino, CA    6
558   A         Fresno, CA                       6
559   A         Eugene, OR                       6
560   B1        Phoenix, AZ                      6

Nonself-representing Non-MSAs:  Northeast

463   A         Schuyler County, NY              8
464   B1        Gardner County, MA               8

Nonself-representing Non-MSAs:  Midwest (North Central in 1980 Census)

465   A         Sanilac County, MI               5
466   B1        Decatur County, IN               8
468   A         Saline County, NE                7
470   A         Mower County, MN                 6

Nonself-representing Non-MSAs:  South

473   A         Bulloch County, GA                7
474   B1        Sabine County, LA                6
476   A         Hale County, TX                  5
477   A         Ashley County, AR                7
478   A         Bedford County, TN                6
480   B1        Montgomery County, VA            8
481   A         Robeson County, NC               7

Nonself-representing Non-MSAs:  West

482   A         El Dorado-Alpine Counties, CA     6
484   A         Carbon County, WY                 5

Total Number of Segments                       364

Third Stage Selection of Housing Units: 1996 NES Panel Component

For each area segment selected in the second sampling stage, a listing was made of all housing units located within the physical boundaries of the segment. For segments with a very large number of expected housing units, all housing units in a subsampled part of the segment were listed. The final equal probability sample of housing units for the 1994 NES was systematically selected from the housing unit listings for the sampled area segments.

The Cross-section component of the 1994 NES sample design was selected from the 1980 SRC National Sample to yield an equal probability sample of households. The distribution of the 1994 NES Cross-section sample is that required by the two-thirds design of the 1980 SRC National Sample. The overall probability of selection for 1994 NES Cross-section households was f=0.00001885 or 0.1885 in 10,000. The equal probability sample of households was achieved for the 1994 NES Cross-section design by using the standard
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multi-stage sampling technique of setting the sampling rate for selecting housing units within area segments to be inversely proportional to the PPS probabilities used to select the PSU and area segment.[8]

The 1994 NES Panel consisted of all 1005 respondents for whom a complete interview was obtained in the 1992 NES Cross-section sample. Respondents in 1994 from both the 1994 Cross-section and the 1994 Panel comprise the 1996 NES Panel.

Fourth Stage Respondent Selection: 1996 NES Panel Component

Within each sampled 1994 NES Cross-section housing unit, the SRC interviewer prepared a complete listing of all eligible household members. Using an objective procedure described by Kish (1949)[9] a single respondent was then selected at random to be interviewed. Regardless of circumstances, no substitutions were permitted for the designated respondent. This technique had also been used in 1992 to select the original Panel respondents. In 1994 the same Panel respondent (R) was sought for interview as had been interviewed in 1992. The 1996 Panel consists of all 1994 NES respondents for whom a complete interview was obtained in the 1994 NES Combined Cross-section and Panel sample. 1795 interviewed respondents make up the 1996 NES Panel component.

Selection Stages for the 1996 NES Cross-section Supplement: 1990 SRC National Sample

Primary Stage Selection: 1996 NES Cross-section Supplement

The selection of primary stage sampling units (PSUs) for the 1990 SRC National Sample, which depending on the sample stratum are either MSAs, New England County Metropolitan Areas (NECMAs), single counties, independent cities, county equivalents or groupings of small counties, is based on the county-level 1990 Census Reports of Population and Housing.[10] Primary stage units were assigned to 108 explicit strata based on MSA/NECMA or non-MSA/NECMA status, PSU size, Census Region and geographic location within region. Twenty-eight of the 108 strata contain only a single self-representing PSU, each of which is included with certainty in the primary stage of sample selection. The remaining 80 nonself-representing strata contain more than one PSU. From each of these nonself-representing strata, one PSU was sampled with probability proportionate to its size (PPS) measured in 1990 occupied housing units.

The full 1990 SRC National Sample of 108 primary stage selections was designed to be optimal for surveys roughly three to five times the size of the 1996 NES. To permit the flexibility needed for optimal design of smaller survey samples, the primary stage of the SRC National Sample can be readily partitioned into smaller subsamples of PSUs such as a one-half sample or a three-quarter sample partition. Each of the partitions represents a stratified subselection from the full 108 (representing the coterminous United States as does the NES study) PSU design. The one-half sample partition of the 1990 National Sample was designed to be roughly comparable in number of PSUs to the two-thirds partition of the 1980 National Sample. The one-half partition of the 1990 National Sample (i.e., the "A" primary sampling units or PSUs) includes 18 of the 28 self-representing MSA PSUs and a stratified subsampling of 40 of the 80 nonself-representing PSUs of the SRC National Sample. The remaining PSUs are divided in half and designated as either B1 or B2. The three-quarter partition includes all of the "A" PSUs plus "B1" PSUs, i.e., five additional self-representing PSUs and twenty additional nonself-representing PSUs.
Since the 1996 NES desired comparison of data over time from 1994 NES respondents, as well as a supplement of eligible 1996 respondents, the 1996 NES sample design includes both a Panel and a Cross-section component. The Panel component of the 1996 NES design consists of all respondents from the both the Panel and the Cross-section components of the 1994 NES sample.[11] The 1996 NES Cross-section supplement component is a new selection of respondents from an area probability sample of households taken from the one-half partition of the new 1990 SRC National Sample. Since emphasis in the 1996 NES Study was to be on the Panel component and a rather small number of 1996 NES Cross-section respondents was sought, a subselection was made from the non-self representing PSUs in the 1990 half-sample partition; seven nonself-representing MSA PSUs and seven non-MSA PSUs were randomly eliminated.

Table 2 identifies the 44 PSUs in the 1996 NES Cross-section supplement by MSA status and Region and also indicates the number of area segments used for the 1996 NES Cross-section supplement (see next section on second stage selection).

Second Stage Selection of Area Segments: 1996 NES Cross-section Supplement

The second stage of the 1990 SRC National Sample, used for the 1996 NES Cross-section supplement, was selected directly from computerized files that were extracted for the selected PSUs from the 1990 U.S. Census summary file series STF1-B. These files (on CD Rom) contain the 1990 Census total population and housing unit (HU) data at the census block level. The designated second-stage sampling units (SSUs), termed "area segments", are comprised of census blocks in both the metropolitan (MSA) primary areas and in the rural areas of non-MSA primary areas. Each SSU block or block combination was assigned a measure of size equal to the total 1990 occupied housing unit count for the area; SSU block(s) were assigned a minimum measure of 72 1990 total HUs per MSA SSU and a minimum measure of 48 total HUs per non-MSA SSU. Second stage sampling of area segments was performed with probabilities proportionate to the assigned measures of size (PPS).

Prior to the second-stage selection, the SSUs were ordered or implicitly stratified within each selected PSU. Block Groups were stratified by household income and, within these income groups, by geography (county, tract, and block). Counties within MSA PSUs having more than one county were ordered by size and distance from the central city of the MSA. (For details, refer to the SRC publication, 1990 National Sample: Design and Development.)

For the 1996 NES Cross-section supplement the number of area segments used in each PSU varies. In the self-representing (SR) PSUs the number of area segments varies in proportion to the size of the primary stage unit, from a high of 13 area segments in the self-representing New York MSA and 12 area segments in Los Angeles MSA, to a low of 4 area segments in the smaller self-representing PSUs such as Cleveland, Miami-Hialeah or Nassau-Suffolk MSAs. All nonself-representing (NSR) PSUs were represented by 4 area segments each. A total of 210 NES Cross-section area segments were selected, 106 in the 18 self-representing PSUs and 104 in the nonself-representing PSUs as shown in Table 2.

Table 2: PSU Name and Number of Area Segments in the 1996 NES Cross-section Supplement
Showing 1990 SRC National-Sample Stratum, Partition, and MSA Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSU Number and Partition</th>
<th>PSU Name</th>
<th># of 1996 NES Panel Segments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eight Largest Self-representing PSUs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 A</td>
<td>New York, NY MSA</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190 A</td>
<td>Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA MSA</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130 A</td>
<td>Chicago, IL MSA</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121 A</td>
<td>Philadelphia, PA-NJ MSA</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131 A</td>
<td>Detroit, MI MSA</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 A</td>
<td>Washington DC-MD-VA MSA</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 A</td>
<td>Boston, MA NECMA</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171 A</td>
<td>Dallas and Ft Worth, TX CMSA</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Ten Remaining Self-representing PSUs |
| 170 A                    | Houston, TX MSA                         | 5                            |
| 191 A                    | Seattle-Tacoma, WA CMSA                 | 4                            |
| 141 A                    | St Louis, MO-IL MSA                     | 4                            |
| 152 A                    | Baltimore, MD MSA                       | 4                            |
| 122 A                    | Nassau-Suffolk, NY MSA                  | 4                            |
| 194 A                    | Anaheim-Santa Ana, CA MSA               | 4                            |
| 132 A                    | Cleveland, OH MSA                       | 4                            |
| 141 A                    | Miami-Hialeah, FL MSA                   | 4                            |
| 181 A                    | Denver, CO MSA                          | 4                            |
| 196 A                    | San Francisco, CA MSA                   | 4                            |

Nonself-representing MSAs: Northeast

| 211 A                    | New Haven-Waterbury-Meriden, CT NECMA   | 4                            |
| 213 A                    | Manchester-Nashua NH NECMA              | 4                            |
| 220 A                    | Buffalo, NY MSA                         | 4                            |
| 226 A                    | Atlantic City, NJ MSA                   | 4                            |

Nonself-representing MSAs: Midwest

| 230 A                    | Milwaukee, WI MSA                       | 4                            |
| 236 A                    | Madison, WI MSA                         | 4                            |
| 239 A                    | Steubenville-Wheeling, OH[12]           | 4                            |
| 240 A                    | Des Moines, IA MSA                      | 4                            |

Nonself-representing MSAs: South

| 250 A                    | Richmond-Petersburg, VA MSA            | 4                            |
| 255 A                    | Columbus, GA-AL MSA                    | 4                            |
| 257 A                    | Jacksonville, FL MSA                   | 4                            |
| 258 A                    | Lakeland, FL MSA                       | 4                            |
| 260 A                    | Knoxville TN MSA                       | 4                            |
| 262 A                    | Birmingham, AL MSA                     | 4                            |
| 274 A                    | McAllen-Edinburg-Mission, TX MSA       | 4                            |

Nonself-representing MSAs: West
Third Stage Selection of Housing Units: 1996 NES Cross-section Supplement

For each area segment selected in the second sampling stage, a listing was made of all housing units located within the physical boundaries of the segment. For segments with a very large number of expected housing units, all housing units in a subselected part of the segment were listed. The final equal probability sample of housing units for the 1996 NES Cross-section supplement was systematically selected from the housing unit listings for the sampled area segments.

The Cross-section supplement of the 1996 NES sample design was selected from the 1990 SRC National Sample to yield an equal probability sample of 803 listed housing units. The 1996 NES Cross-section supplement drawn was ten percent larger than the expected required sample size of 730 lines to allow for additional "reserve" sample replicates to be released if necessary to meet interview goals. The overall probability of selection for 1996 NES Cross-section households was \( f=0.000007500 \) or 0.07500 in 10,000. The equal probability sample of households was achieved for the 1996 NES Cross-section supplement by using the standard multi-stage sampling technique of setting the sampling rate for selecting housing units within area segments to be inversely proportional to the PPS probabilities used to select the PSU and area segment.[14]

Fourth Stage Respondent Selection: 1996 NES Cross-section Supplement

Within each sampled 1996 NES Cross-section housing unit, the SRC interviewer prepared a complete listing of all eligible household members. Using an objective procedure described by Kish (1949)[15] a single respondent was then selected at random to be interviewed. Regardless of circumstances, no substitutions were permitted for the designated respondent. This technique had also been used in 1992 and 1994 to select the original Panel respondents. In 1996 the same Panel respondent (R) was sought for interview as had been interviewed in 1992 and 1994.
1996 NES SAMPLE DESIGN SPECIFICATIONS

The 1996 Pre/Post-election Study sought a total of 1750 interviews in the Pre-election phase, all of which were to be contacted for reinterview in the Post-election phase.

THE PRE-ELECTION PHASE:

The 1996 NES sample design included both Panel and Cross-section components for the Pre-election phase, but emphasis in the 1996 NES design was on obtaining a maximum number of Panel interviews. To this end, the 1996 NES Panel component included the full set of 1795 1994 NES respondents, 1036 from the 1994 NES Cross-section component and 759 from the 1994 NES Panel component. Given sample design assumptions for the 1996 NES Panel of an eligibility rate of 0.98 and response rate of 0.75, this component was expected to yield 1320 interviews in 1996.

The 1996 NES Cross-section supplement was intended to yield 430 interviews. It was estimated that this would require a NES Cross-section sample draw of 730 housing units. This assumed an occupancy/growth rate of 0.86, an eligibility rate of 0.95 and a response rate of 0.72. The overall 1996 NES Pre-election sample Design is set out in Table 3, below.

Table 3: Sample Design Specifications and Assumptions 1996 Pre/Post-election Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cross-section Component</th>
<th>Panel Component</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed Interviews</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Rate</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible Sample Households</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>1760</td>
<td>2357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility Rate</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel Recontact Rate</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Households</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>1795</td>
<td>2423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy/growth Rate</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample Lines</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>1795</td>
<td>2525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample Design, and Assignment of Replicates

The Cross-section supplement of the 1996 NES sample was drawn from the recently listed "A" or half-sample partition of the 1990 SRC National Sample. Because of the small size of this NES sample component, both the number of PSUs (selected primary areas) and the Secondary Selection Units (area segments) in the National half-sample were reduced by subselection for the 1996 NES sample design.[16] The 18 self-representing areas in the 1990 SRC National half-sample were all retained for the Cross-section supplement (8 of these remained self-representing in the half-sample and 10 represent not only their own MSA but their "pair" among the twenty additional self-representing primary areas of the full 1990 SRC National Sample design). Nineteen of the 26 non-self-representing MSAs and 7 of the 14 non-MSAs were retained for the 1996 NES Cross-section supplement (or 26 of 40 NSR PSUs).
The number of second stage units (SSUs or area segments) was also reduced for the 1996 NES Cross-section supplement. In self-representing PSUs, the number of segments was reduced by one-half with a minimum of four segments in any PSU. In the nonself-representing PSUs, the number of segments was reduced to two-thirds, from six to four segments per PSU. This resulted in a total of 210 segments or SSUs from which the 1996 NES Cross-section supplement was selected.

There could be no reduction of the total number of segments or of persons in the 1996 NES Panel component since all 1994 NES respondents were to be recontacted for interview in 1996. The number of area segments represented by the 1795 respondents to the 1994 study eligible for the 1996 NES Panel was 364.

Both the 1996 NES Cross-section supplement and the 1996 NES Panel were divided by segment into two replicate samples. Replicates 1 and 2 of the 1996 NES Cross-section supplement each included 105 segments. The original replicate assignment of Panel segments also resulted in an even division of those segments by replicate.

1996 NES Cross-section Supplement Selection and Assignment of Releases

The 1996 NES Cross-section supplement drawn was ten percent larger than the expected required sample size of 730 listed housing units to allow for additional "reserve" sample replicates. Final number of housing units in the Cross-section supplement was 803 spread over the 210 area segments as outlined below.

Selected lines in each of the two replicates were divided into two equal parts to accommodate 4 quarterly releases. The quarterly releases were designed to assess effect on voter opinion formation of news events which occurred at various times over the course of the study. The first replicate sample was divided into release 1 and 2; the second replicate sample into release 3 and 4. An additional two reserve releases (5 and 6) equal to 73 lines, or 10% of the total 1996 NES Cross-section supplement, were also drawn from Replicate 2 to be released with releases 3 and 4, if necessary to meet study interview goals. Both reserve releases 5 and 6 were, in fact, released.

Although Replicates 1 and 2 are each made up of different area segments (except as modified by the request to include Panel Rs needing tracking in Releases 1 and 2), all 1996 NES Cross-section and Panel Primary Areas are included in each Replicate if they contained more than a single segment. In contrast to the assignment of replicates by area segment, releases were originally specified in the 1996 NES sample design to be assigned across the HU-level file, rather than by area segment so any segment having more than one selection will have the selections distributed across Releases 1 and 2 (or 3, 4, 5 and 6 for Replicate 2 segments). In order to increase the efficiency of the field interviewing effort, original releases 3 and 4 were later revised such that their assignment was based on area segment, rather than across all Replicate 2 segments.

1996 NES PRE-ELECTION SAMPLE OUTCOME:

Table 4: 1996 NES Pre-Election Sample Design Specifications and Assumptions Compared to Sample Outcome. 1996 Pre/Post-election Survey [17]
A comparison of the total design figures compared to the Pre-election outcome figures in Table 4 indicates the following: for the 1996 NES Panel component, where there was no option for reserve releases, and where primary field effort was placed, eligibility and response rates equal to those anticipated resulted in a number of completed interviews very close to that projected by the sample design. On the other hand, for the 1996 NES Cross-section supplement, even with the release of reserve replicates, a lower than expected response rate resulted in a seven percent shortfall in number of completed interviews. Since the Cross-section supplement made up less than one-quarter of the total sample design, the overall shortfall in number of completed interviews was only two percent.

THE POST-ELECTION PHASE:

The study design for the 1996 Post-election component of the NES Study called for recontact of all respondents to the 1996 NES Pre-election survey (both those originally in the Panel component and those in the Cross-section supplement.) The Post-election phase of the 1996 NES included a mode experiment which called for the random assignment, by area segment, of the majority of these respondents, to be recontacted after the election for an interview either by phone or in person. Those to be excluded from this mode experiment were those respondents either 1) who were interviewed by phone during the Pre-election study or 2) who were known to not have a phone. The assignment to either the phone or the in-person mode was made on the basis of segment, such that approximately half of the Post-election recontacts made by phone and the other half in person. Since the Post-election phase of the study involved no new respondents--all respondents were considered Panel respondents for this phase. A combined recontact and response rate of 85% was assumed for the Post-election phase of the 1996 NES to yield a total of 1460 interviews.

Of the total of 1714 interviews completed for the 1996 Pre-election study, the sample released for Post-election recontact was distributed as shown in Table 5. Post-election interview outcome is also shown on this table. The combined recontact and response rate exceeded expectations resulting in a total number of Post-election interviews over the 1460 goal.

Table 5. Post-election Mode Distribution and Interview Outcome for 1996 NES.[18]
WEIGHTED ANALYSIS OF 1996 NES DATA

The 1996 NES data set includes two final person-level analysis weights which incorporate sampling, nonresponse and post-stratification factors. One weight (variable #4) is for longitudinal micro-level analysis using the 1996 NES Panel. The other weight (variable #3) is for analysis of the 1996 NES combined sample (Panel component cases plus Cross-section supplement cases). In addition, a Time Series Weight (variable #5) which corrects for Panel attrition was constructed. This weight should be used in analyses which compare the 1996 NES to earlier unweighted National Election Study data collections. Analysts interested in developing their own nonresponse or post-stratification adjustment factors must request access to the necessary sample control data from the NES Board.

CONSTRUCTION OF ANALYSIS WEIGHTS

Sample Selection Weight

The area probability sample design for the 1996 NES results in an equal probability sample of U.S. households. However, within sample households a single adult respondent is chosen at random to be interviewed. Since the number of eligible adults may vary from one household to another, the random selection of a single adult introduces inequality into respondents' selection probabilities. In analysis, a respondent selection weight should be used to compensate for these unequal selection probabilities. The value of the respondent selection weight is exactly equal to the number of eligible adults in the household from which the random respondent was selected. The use of the respondent selection weight is strongly encouraged, despite past evaluations which have shown these weights to have little significant impact on the values of NES estimates of descriptive statistics.

Household Nonresponse Adjustment Factor

Nonresponse adjustment factors were constructed at the household level separately for Panel and Cross-section component cases. Nonresponse adjustment cells for the relatively small 1996 NES Cross-section supplement were formed by crossing PSU type (Self-representing, Nonself-representing MSA or non-MSA) by the four Census regions (Northeast, Midwest, South, and West). A nonresponse factor equal to the inverse of the response rate in each cell was applied to the interview cases.
For the larger number of Panel cases, 1996 nonresponse adjustment cells were initially formed by crossing PSU type by the nine Census divisions (New England, Middle Atlantic, East North Central, West North Central, South Atlantic, East South Central, West South Central, Mountain and Pacific). However, in order to have a minimum of approximately 25 cases in each nonresponse adjustment cell, some cells were collapsed across Census Divisions in the same Census Region. Tables 6 and 7 show the 1996 nonresponse adjustment factors for the Cross-section supplement and for the Panel respectively. The 1996 NES Panel nonresponse prior to 1996 was reflected in the 1994 full sample weight which was used to construct 1996 NES Panel final sample weights.

Table 6

Computation of Nonresponse Adjustment Weights -- 1996 NES Cross Section Supplement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSU Type</th>
<th>Census Region</th>
<th>Response Rate (%)</th>
<th>Nonresponse Adjustment Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR-MSA</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>42.31</td>
<td>2.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>53.33</td>
<td>1.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td>53.85</td>
<td>1.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>50.70</td>
<td>1.972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSR-MSA</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>52.63</td>
<td>1.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>67.80</td>
<td>1.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td>64.55</td>
<td>1.549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>62.50</td>
<td>1.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSR-non MSA</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>1.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>72.09</td>
<td>1.387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td>68.67</td>
<td>1.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>80.95</td>
<td>1.235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7

Computation of Nonresponse Adjustment Weights -- 1996 NES Panel Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSU Type</th>
<th>Census Division</th>
<th>Response Rate (%)</th>
<th>Nonresponse Adjustment Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR-MSA</td>
<td>New England &amp; Middle Atlantic</td>
<td>72.90</td>
<td>1.372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East North</td>
<td>72.50</td>
<td>1.379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>86.05</td>
<td>1.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West North</td>
<td>77.91</td>
<td>1.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
<td>63.64</td>
<td>1.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>65.85</td>
<td>1.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSR-MSA</td>
<td>New England &amp; Middle Atlantic</td>
<td>71.96</td>
<td>1.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East North</td>
<td>76.03</td>
<td>1.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>70.77</td>
<td>1.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West North</td>
<td>76.71</td>
<td>1.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East South</td>
<td>64.71</td>
<td>1.545</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a first step in post-stratifying the sample to 1990 Census proportions, an intermediate weight for the 1996 NES combined sample (Cross-section plus Panel cases) was constructed as follows. First an intermediate weight for Cross-section supplement cases was constructed by multiplying the 1996 Cross-section nonresponse adjustment (Table 6) by the number of eligible persons in the sample household[19] by an inflation factor which is the 1995 estimated U.S. households divided by the number of eligible households (97,061,000/661). This initial weight was used to produce a weighted sex by age group by Census Region table for the 1996 NES Cross-section supplement. The age categories used were: 18-44 years, 45-64 years, and 65+ years. Post-stratification factors were constructed to match the sample proportions in the 24 sex by age by Region cells to the July 1995 Census population projections (Current Population Reports, P25-1111, Table 4) by dividing the Census total by the weighted sample estimate for each post-stratification cell. Because of the small number of Cross-section supplement cases, it is not intended that Cross-section only analysis be undertaken.

An intermediate weight factor for the 1996 NES Panel cases was similarly constructed by multiplying the 1996 nonresponse adjustment (Table 7) by the 1994 full sample weight times the reciprocal of the constant used to center the 1994 weights (1993 estimated U.S. population 18 or more years of age / number of 1994 respondents).[20] For the 1996 NES Panel respondents, the number of eligible persons in the household and nonresponse prior to 1996 was reflected in the 1994 full sample weight. The last element in this computation was necessary to restore the Panel intermediate weight to its full representation of the population. This intermediate weight was used for Panel cases to produce a weighted sex by age group by Census Region table as described above. Again, post-stratification weights were constructed to match the sample proportions in the 24 sex by age group by Census Region cells to the July 1995 Census population projections.

1996 NES Panel Post-Stratification Factor

For 1996 NES combined Panel and Cross-section analysis, the proportion of respondents contributed to the total sample was adjusted for by multiplying the Panel case intermediate weight by the proportion of Panel cases (1316/1714) and multiplying the Cross-section case intermediate weight by the proportion of Cross-section cases (398/1714). Thus a combined Cross-section...
and Panel post-stratification weight was produced, by dividing the 1995 Census estimated totals in the 24 sex by age group by Census Region cells by the corresponding weighted estimates for the combined sample. The figures for this combined post-stratification factor are shown in Table 8. It is these figures, centered as explained below, which are used for the final 1996 combined sample weight (V3). The final analysis weight (V4) for longitudinal analysis of the 1996 NES Panel is the product of the 1994 full sample weight, the 1996 Panel household nonresponse adjustment factor, and the Panel post-stratification factor.

**FINAL ANALYSIS WEIGHTS**

The final analysis weights are the product of the household level non-response adjustment factor, the number of eligible persons, the sample selection (inflation) weight and the post-stratification factor. The final analysis weight for the Panel-only analysis (V4) is centered so that the sum of the weights is equal to the total number of Panel respondents, 1316. The final analysis weights for the combined 1996 NES sample (V3) sums to 1714, the total number of respondents. These weights were constructed using the 1996 NES Pre-election data set. The nonresponse and attrition between the Pre and Post-election studies are not incorporated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>18-44</td>
<td>10,440,000</td>
<td>9,885,067</td>
<td>1.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>5,019,000</td>
<td>5,329,059</td>
<td>0.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>2,892,000</td>
<td>3,152,420</td>
<td>0.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>18-44</td>
<td>12,645,000</td>
<td>10,248,770</td>
<td>1.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>5,870,000</td>
<td>7,553,155</td>
<td>0.777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>3,310,000</td>
<td>3,215,352</td>
<td>1.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td>18-44</td>
<td>18,919,000</td>
<td>15,799,320</td>
<td>1.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>8,691,000</td>
<td>8,455,024</td>
<td>1.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>4,789,000</td>
<td>5,216,866</td>
<td>0.918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>18-44</td>
<td>12,778,000</td>
<td>9,478,170</td>
<td>1.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>5,298,000</td>
<td>5,349,446</td>
<td>0.990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>2,708,000</td>
<td>2,347,394</td>
<td>1.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>18-44</td>
<td>10,630,000</td>
<td>8,990,888</td>
<td>1.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>5,503,000</td>
<td>5,895,540</td>
<td>0.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>4,378,000</td>
<td>3,556,867</td>
<td>1.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>18-44</td>
<td>12,749,000</td>
<td>11,606,790</td>
<td>1.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>6,234,000</td>
<td>6,622,310</td>
<td>0.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>4,871,000</td>
<td>4,952,220</td>
<td>0.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td>18-44</td>
<td>19,077,000</td>
<td>20,443,010</td>
<td>0.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>9,397,000</td>
<td>9,362,888</td>
<td>1.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>7,016,000</td>
<td>6,738,762</td>
<td>1.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>18-44</td>
<td>12,169,000</td>
<td>11,691,630</td>
<td>1.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>5,454,000</td>
<td>5,937,677</td>
<td>0.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>3,686,000</td>
<td>3,664,183</td>
<td>1.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>194,523,000</td>
<td>185,492,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONSTRUCTION OF TIME SERIES WEIGHT

The 1996 NES Panel consists of 759 respondents originally selected for the 1992 NES Pre-election Study (1994 NES Panel) and 1036 respondents originally selected for the 1994 NES Study (1994 NES Cross-section). All of the 1005 1992 Post-election respondents were eligible for the 1994 NES Panel and 759 of these responded in 1994 and remained eligible for the 1996 NES Panel. Of these 759 respondents from the 1992 NES (1994 Panel), 597 were interviewed for the 1996 NES. Of the 1036 respondents from the 1994 Cross-section, 719 were interviewed in 1996 for an overall 1996 NES Panel response rate of 1316/1795 or 0.733.[22]

Table 9:
Time Series Weight Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Residence</th>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Time Series Weight Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 3</td>
<td>&lt; HS Graduate</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>1.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>1.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40-64</td>
<td>1.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>1.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS Graduate</td>
<td>17-24</td>
<td>1.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>1.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40-64</td>
<td>0.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>1.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; HS Graduate</td>
<td>17-24</td>
<td>0.958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>0.978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40-64</td>
<td>0.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>0.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+</td>
<td>&lt; HS Grad</td>
<td>17-39</td>
<td>1.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40-64</td>
<td>0.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>1.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75+</td>
<td>1.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS Graduate</td>
<td>17-24</td>
<td>1.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>1.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40-64</td>
<td>0.990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>1.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75+</td>
<td>0.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; HS Graduate</td>
<td>17-24</td>
<td>1.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>0.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40-64</td>
<td>0.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>0.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75+</td>
<td>1.057</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROCEDURES FOR SAMPLING ERROR ESTIMATION

The 1996 NES sample design is based on a stratified multi-stage area probability sample of United States households. Although smaller in scale, the NES sample design is very similar in its basic structure to the multi-stage designs used for major federal survey programs such as the Health Interview Survey (HIS) or the Current Population Survey (CPS). The survey literature refers to the NES, HIS and CPS samples as complex designs, a loosely-used term meant to denote the fact that the sample incorporates special design features such as stratification, clustering and differential selection probabilities (i.e., weighting) that analysts must consider in computing sampling errors for sample estimates of descriptive statistics and model parameters. This section
of the 1996 NES sample design description focuses on sampling error estimation and construction of confidence intervals for survey estimates of descriptive statistics such as means, proportions, ratios, and coefficients for linear and logistic linear regression models.

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

Sampling Error Computation Methods and Programs

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

1. Linearization Approach

If data are collected using a complex sample design with unequal size clusters, most statistics of interest will not be simple linear functions of the observed data. The objective of the linearization approach is to apply Taylor's method to derive an approximate form of the estimator that is linear in statistics for which variances and covariances can be directly estimated. (Kish, 1965; Woodruff, 1971). Linearized variance approximations are derived for estimators of ratio means (Kish and Hess, 1959); finite population regression coefficients and correlation coefficients (Kish and Frankel, 1974); and many other non-linear statistics. Software packages such as SUDAAN and PC CARP (see below) use the Taylor Series linearization method to estimate standard errors for the coefficients of logistic regression models. In these programs, an iteratively reweighted least squares algorithm is used to compute maximum likelihood estimates of model parameters. At each step of the model fitting algorithm, a Taylor Series linearization approach is used to compute the variance/covariance matrix for the current iteration's parameter estimates (Binder, 1983).

Available sampling error computation software that utilizes the Taylor Series linearization method includes: STATA, SUDAAN and PC SUDAAN, SUPERCARP AND PC CARP, and CLUSTERS. PC SUDAAN, PC CARP and STATA include procedures for estimation of sampling error both for descriptive statistics such as means, proportions, totals and for parameters of commonly used multivariate models (least squares regression, logistic regression).

2. Resampling Approaches

In the mid-1940's, P.C. Mahalanobis (1946) outlined a simple replicated...
procedure for selecting probability samples that permits simple, unbiased estimation of variances. The practical difficulty with the simple replicated approach to design and variance estimation is that many replicates are needed to achieve stability of the variance estimator. Unfortunately, a design with many independent replicates must utilize a coarser stratification than alternative designs--to achieve stable variance estimates, sample precision must be sacrificed. Balanced Repeated Replication (BRR), Jackknife Repeated Replication (JRR) and the Bootstrap are alternative replication techniques that may be used for estimating sampling errors for statistics based on complex sample data.

The BRR method is applicable to stratified designs in which two half-sample units (i.e., PSUs) are selected from each design stratum. The conventional "two PSU-per-stratum" design in the best theoretical example of such a design although in practice, collapsing of strata (Kalton, 1977) and random combination of units within strata are employed to restructure a sample design for BRR variance estimation. The half-sample codes prepared for the 1994 NES data set require the collapsing of nonself-representing strata and the randomized combination of selection units within self-representing (SR) strata. When full balancing of the half-sample assignments is employed (Wolter, 1985), BRR is the most computationally efficient of the replicated variance estimation techniques. The number of general purpose BRR sampling error estimation programs in the public domain is limited. The OSIRIS REPERR program includes the option for BRR estimation of sampling errors for least squares regression coefficients and correlation statistics. Westat, Inc. has developed the Westvar PC for BRR estimation of standard errors. Another option is to use SAS or SPSS Macro facilities to implement the relatively simple BRR algorithm. The necessary computation formulas and Hadamard matrices to define the half-sample replicates are available in Wolter (1985).

With improvements in computational flexibility and speed, jackknife (JRR) and bootstrap methods for sampling error estimation and inference have become more common (Rao and Wu, 1988). Few general purpose programs for jackknife estimation of variances are available to analysts. OSIRIS REPERR has a JRR module for estimation of standard errors for regression and correlation statistics. Other stand alone programs may also be available in the general survey research community. Like BRR, the algorithm for JRR is relatively easy to program using SAS, SPSS or S-Plus macro facilities.

BRR and JRR are variance estimation techniques, each designed to minimize the number of "resamplings" needed to compute the variance estimate. In theory, the bootstrap is not simply a tool for variance estimation but an approach to actual inference for statistics. In practice, the bootstrap is implemented by resampling (with replacement) from the observed sample units. To ensure that the full complexity of the design is reflected, the selection of each bootstrap reflects the full complexity of the stratification, clustering and weighting that is present in the original sample design. A large number of bootstrap samples are selected and the statistic of interest is computed for each. The empirical distribution of the estimate that results from the large set of bootstrap samples can then be used to compute a variance estimate and a support interval for inference about the population statistic of interest.

In most practical survey analysis problems, the JRR and Bootstrap methods should yield similar results. Most survey analysts should choose JRR due to its computational efficiency. NES data analysts interested in the bootstrap technique are referred to LePage and Billard (1992) for additional reading and a bibliography for the general literature on this topic.
One aspect of BRR, JRR and bootstrap variance estimation that is often pushed aside in practice is the treatment of analysis weights. In theory, when a resampling occurs (i.e., a BRR half sample is formed), the analysis weights should be recomputed based only on the selection probabilities, nonresponse characteristics and post-stratification outcomes for the units included in the resample. This is the correct way of performing resampling variance estimation; however, in practice acceptable estimates can be obtained through use of the weights as they are provided on the public use data set.

Sampling Error Computation Models

Regardless of whether linearization or a resampling approach is used, estimation of variances for complex sample survey estimates requires the specification of a sampling error computation model. NES data analysts who are interested in performing sampling error computations should be aware that the estimation programs identified in the preceding section assume a specific sampling error computation model and will require special sampling error codes. Individual records in the analysis data set must be assigned sampling error codes which identify to the programs the complex structure of the sample (stratification, clustering) and are compatible with the computation algorithms of the various programs. To facilitate the computation of sampling error for statistics based on 1996 NES data, design-specific sampling error codes will be routinely included in all public-use versions of the data set. Although minor recoding may be required to conform to the input requirements of the individual programs, the sampling error codes that are provided should enable analysts to conduct either Taylor Series or Replicated estimation of sampling errors for survey statistics.

Table 10 defines the sampling error coding system for 1996 NES sample cases. Two sampling error code variables are defined for each case based on the sample design primary stage unit (PSU) and area segment in which the sample household is located.

Sampling Error Stratum Code (Variable #2125). The Sampling Error Computation Stratum Code is the variable which defines the sampling error computation strata for all sampling error analysis of the NES data. With the exception of the New York, Los Angeles and Chicago MSAs, each self-representing (SR) design stratum is represented by one sampling error computation stratum. Due to their population size, two sampling error computation strata are defined for each of the three largest MSAs. Pairs of similar nonself-representing (NSR) primary stage design strata are "collapsed" (Kalton, 1977) to create NSR sampling error computation strata.

For both the 1980 and 1990 SRC National Sample design controlled selection and a "one-per-stratum" PSU allocation are used to select the primary stage of the 1996 NES national sample. The purpose in using controlled selection and the "one-per-stratum" sample allocation is to reduce the between-PSU component of sampling variation relative to a "two-per-stratum" primary stage design. Despite the expected improvement in sample precision, a drawback of the "one-per-stratum" design is that two or more sample selection strata must be collapsed or combined to form a sampling error computation stratum. Variances are then estimated under the assumption that a multiple PSU per stratum design was actually used for primary stage selection. The expected consequence of collapsing design strata into sampling error computation strata is the overestimation of the true sampling error; that is, the sampling error computation model defined by the codes contained in Table 14 will yield estimates of sampling errors which in expectation will be slightly greater than the true sampling error of the statistic of interest.
SECU - Stratum-specific Sampling Error Computation Unit code (Variable #2126) is a half sample code for analysis of sampling error using the BRR method or approximate "two-per-stratum" Taylor Series method (Kish and Hess, 1959). Within the SR sampling error strata, the SECU half sample units are created by dividing sample cases into random halves, SECU=1 and SECU=2. The assignment of cases to half-samples is designed to preserve the stratification and second stage clustering properties of the sample within an SR stratum. Sample cases are assigned to SECU half samples based on the area segment in which they were selected. For this assignment, sample cases were placed in original stratification order (area segment number order) and beginning with a random start entire area segment clusters were systematically assigned to either SECU=1 or SECU=2.

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

Table 10 shows the sampling error stratum and SECU codes to be used for the paired selection model for sampling error computations for any 1996 NES analyses; the same codes can be used when using the 1996 NES combined Cross-section/Panel data or when using 1996 NES Panel data separately. The first 42 strata reflect the two-thirds 1980 National Sample design used in 1994 and apply to the 1996 NES Panel. Strata 51 through 89 reflect the half sample 1990 National Sample design used for the 1996 NES Cross-section supplement.

It can be seen from this table that the three-digit 1996 SE code is comprised of: first, the two-digit SE Stratum code followed by the one-digit SECU code.

Table 10: 1996 National Election Study Sampling Error Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>1 011</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>103 119 135</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 012</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>107 123 139</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>1 021</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>111 127 143</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 022</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>115 131 148</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>1 031</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>110 123 136</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 032</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>101 114</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>1 041</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>117 129</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 042</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>107 120 133</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>1 051</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>112 129</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 052</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>117 134</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>1 061</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>103 120</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 062</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>107 125</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>1 071</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>102 110 117</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 072</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>106 113 121</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SE</th>
<th>SEC</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>Segment #s</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1992,1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(In 1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

<p>| | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>004</td>
<td>006</td>
<td>09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>002</td>
<td>003</td>
<td>005</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>002</td>
<td>004</td>
<td>005</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>005</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>002</td>
<td>004</td>
<td>005</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>002</td>
<td>006</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>002</td>
<td>003</td>
<td>005</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>005</td>
<td>006</td>
<td>008</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>002</td>
<td>004</td>
<td>007</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>003</td>
<td>005</td>
<td>006</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>002</td>
<td>005</td>
<td>006</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>002</td>
<td>005</td>
<td>006</td>
<td>007</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>004</td>
<td>005</td>
<td>007</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>002</td>
<td>004</td>
<td>005</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1996 NES Cross-section Segments (from 1990 National Sample Frame):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>SEC</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>Segment #s</th>
<th>Total Rs (1996)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>003, 019, 035, 051</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>067, 083, 099</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>011, 027, 043,</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>059, 075, 091</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>003, 019, 035,</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>196[23] 051, 067, 083</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>002, 014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>011, 027, 043,</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>190 059, 075, 091</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>196[24] 010, 022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>SEC</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>Segment #s</th>
<th>Total Rs (1996)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>008, 024, 040,</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>056, 072</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>016, 032, 048,</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>064</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>006, 022, 038, 054</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>014, 030, 046</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>004, 020, 036</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>012, 028, 044</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>003, 019, 035</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>011, 027, 043</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>006, 022, 038</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>014, 030, 046</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>003, 019, 035</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>011, 027</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>008, 024, 040</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>016, 032, 048</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>004, 020</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>012, 028</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>008, 024</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>016, 032</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>001, 013</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>009, 021</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>008, 024</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>016, 032</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>003, 015</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>007, 019</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>004, 020</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>012, 028</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>005, 013, 021, 029</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>005, 009, 017, 021</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>005, 009, 017, 021</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>002, 006, 014, 018</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>003, 011, 015, 023</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Generalized Sampling Error Results for the 1996 NES

To assist NES analysts, the PC SUDAAN program was used to compute sampling errors for a wide-ranging example set of proportions estimated from the 1996 NES Pre-election Survey data set. For each estimate, sampling errors were computed for the total sample and for twenty demographic and political affiliation subclasses of the 1996 NES Pre-election Survey sample. The results of these sampling error computations were then summarized and translated into the general usage sampling error table provided in Table 11. The mean value of deft, the square root of the design effect, was found to be 1.346. The design effect was primarily due to weighting effects (Kish, 1965) and did not vary significantly by subclass size. Therefore the generalized variance table is produced by multiplying the simple random sampling standard error for each proportion and sample size by the average deft for the set of sampling error computations.

Incorporating the pattern of "design effects" observed in the extensive set of example computations, Table 11 provides approximate standard errors for percentage estimates based on the 1996 NES. To use the table, examine the column heading to find the percentage value which best approximates the value of the estimated percentage that is of interest. [25] Next, locate the approximate sample size base (denominator for the proportion) in the left-hand row margin of the table. To find the approximate standard error of a percentage estimate, simply cross-reference the appropriate column (percentage) and row (sample size base). Note: the tabulated values represent approximately one standard error for the percentage estimate. To construct an approximate confidence interval, the analyst should apply the appropriate critical point from the "z" distribution (e.g., \(z=1.96\) for a two-sided 95% confidence interval half-width). Furthermore, the approximate standard errors in the table apply only to single point estimates of percentages not to the difference between two percentage estimates.
The generalized variance results presented in Table 11 are a useful tool for initial, cursory examination of the NES survey results. For more in depth analysis and reporting of critical estimates, analysts are encouraged to compute exact estimates of standard errors using the appropriate choice of a sampling error program and computation model.

Table 11: Generalized Variance Table. 1996 NES Pre/Post-election Survey.

APPROXIMATE STANDARD ERRORS FOR PERCENTAGES

For percentage estimates near:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample n</th>
<th>50% or 60%</th>
<th>40% or 70%</th>
<th>30% or 80%</th>
<th>20% or 90%</th>
<th>10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>6.730</td>
<td>6.594</td>
<td>6.168</td>
<td>5.384</td>
<td>4.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.759</td>
<td>4.663</td>
<td>4.362</td>
<td>3.807</td>
<td>2.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>3.886</td>
<td>3.807</td>
<td>3.561</td>
<td>3.108</td>
<td>2.331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>3.365</td>
<td>3.297</td>
<td>3.084</td>
<td>2.692</td>
<td>2.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>3.010</td>
<td>2.949</td>
<td>2.758</td>
<td>2.408</td>
<td>1.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750</td>
<td>2.475</td>
<td>2.408</td>
<td>2.252</td>
<td>1.966</td>
<td>1.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>2.128</td>
<td>2.085</td>
<td>1.951</td>
<td>1.703</td>
<td>1.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250</td>
<td>1.904</td>
<td>1.865</td>
<td>1.745</td>
<td>1.523</td>
<td>1.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1.738</td>
<td>1.703</td>
<td>1.593</td>
<td>1.390</td>
<td>1.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1714</td>
<td>1.626</td>
<td>1.593</td>
<td>1.490</td>
<td>1.300</td>
<td>0.975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The approximate standard error of the percentage is:
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Footnotes

1 NECMAs are used in the 1996 NES Cross-section component only, which is drawn from the 1990 SRC National Sample.

2 The 730 listed housing units projected to be necessary to produce the 430 interviews from the 1996 NES Cross-section supplement were increased by 10% (73) for reserve releases. The 803 listed housing units selected for this component of the 1996 NES Sample actually yielded 666 eligible households within which an interview was attempted.


4 The 1994 NES Panel consisted of all 1005 Respondents from the 1992 NES Cross-section sample. Of these, 925 were recontacted in the 1993 NES Pilot Study (a follow-up of the 1992 NES survey), of which 750 were re-interviewed, 98 refused to be re-interviewed and 77 could not be re-interviewed at that time due to some 'permanent' condition. 80 of the 1005 1992 NES Cross-section respondents could not be found for re-interview in 1993.

5 Analysis of pooled data from respondents from both components of the 1994 NES sample requires a strong assumption about the nature of the attrition of the 1992 NES Cross-section sample. It must be assumed that Panel attrition is not correlated with variables under consideration in the analysis.

6 Non-MSA segments were selected from the 1980 Census summary tape file series STF1B file, with minimum SSU size of 50 occupied HUs.

7 The number of segments shown for the 1996 NES Panel is the expected count; it is based on the number of 1994 NES Cross-section and Panel segments having selected lines. It is possible that some of these segments yielded no 1994 interviews and so do not actually show up in the 1996 Panel.


10 Office of Management and Budget (OMB) June 1990 definitions of MSAs, NECMAs, county, parish, independent city. These, of course, differ in some respects from the primary stage unit (PSU) definitions used in the 1980 SRC National Sample so will not be strictly comparable to the 1996 NES Panel PSUs—particularly in New England where MSAs were used as PSUs in the 1980 National Sample and NECMAs were used as PSUs in the 1990 National Sample.

11 For more detailed description of original Panel component selection, see appropriate sections earlier in this document.

12 In the 1990 SRC National Sample, U.S. Census Region boundaries were maintained for purposes of stratification at the Primary Stage of selection. Since some MSA definitions cross Region boundaries, such MSAs were split and the MSA counties recombed in ways that maintained the Region boundary. This PSU actually contains the Ohio counties from both the Steubenville-Wheeling, OH-WV MSA (Jefferson County, OH) and the Wheeling, WV-OH MSA (Belmont County, OH) and although it is made up of MSA counties—it is not a cohesive MSA by OMB 1990 definition.

13 For efficiency of field work the substitution of two "B1" PSUs was allowed for the "A" areas in the normal 1990 half-sample—Waco, TX MSA for Oklahoma City, OK MSA and Jim Wells County, TX for Lavaca County, TX.


16 See appropriate sections earlier in this report for details of the Cross-section supplement of the 1996 NES sample.

17 Outcome figures are from the 1996 National Pre-election Study Field Progress Report, February 28, 1997.

18 Figures in this table are from the 1996 National Post-Election Study Field Progress Report, April 18, 1997.

19 In constructing the analysis weight, a maximum of three eligible adults was allowed.

20 See 1994 NES sample weight documentation.

21 Weighted by 'Intermediate factor' for Cross-section and Panel cases weighted proportionately as described above for 1996 NES combined Cross-section and panel analysis.

22 This 1996 Panel response rate appears lower than the 0.76 reported on Table 4 which was computed based on recontacted households having the eligible R from the 1994 study and actual 1996 NES sample release and interview figures from the 1996 NES final field report.
23 The four San Francisco (separated from Oakland, CA in the 1990 OMB definition), CA MSA area segments were considered as part of the Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA MSA for purposes of SE Code assignment to avoid having empty SE CODE cells since there were very few 1996 NES Cross-section respondents in this MSA.

24 See footnote #23.

25 The standard error of a percentage is a symmetric function with its maximum centered at p=50%; i.e., the standard error of p=40% and p=60% estimates are equal.

>>1997 NES Pilot Technical Note - Randomization Problem

April 24, 1998

The Surveycraft CATI system's 'Random Number Generation' features and their Effects on Analysis of the 1997 NES Pilot "Group threat" Experiment.

Steve Heeringa, Division of Survey Technologies, Survey Research Center

Executive Summary: A problem has been identified in the random assignment of treatments in an experimental question module of the 1997 NES Pilot survey instrument. The randomization problem has been linked to unexpected correlation in sequences of random number calls made within the Surveycraft computer-assisted interviewing system. The problem does produce an unbalanced distribution of sample cases to the cells of the factorial experimental design but does not lead to a bias in the interpretation of the experimental results. Details are provided below. A report that analyzes these items is the 1997 pilot study report by J. Bowers.

A portion of the 1997 NES Pilot questionnaire (section 'J') includes a "group threat" factorial experimental design to study question order and threat level treatment effects in a series of items that explore respondent views and prejudices toward African-Americans and Christian Fundamentalists.

The full design involves 2 question sequence orderings - African-Americans first or Christian Fundamentalists first; 2 levels of intended "threat" – high and low; and 3 'threat domains': political, social and economic. The Survey Craft computer assisted interview (CAI) application used an internal random number generator to determine each subject's assignment to target group order and threat level for the questions about each target group. A different Surveycraft function was used to randomize the order of the three threat domains, once the group and threat level were determined.

The intent of the CAI programming was to randomly assign the group order, threat level by group and threat domain for each respondent. Complete randomization of choice for each of these three experimental components is expected to yield equal numbers of cases at each combination of treatment for the 2 x 2 x 3 factorial design. In practice, due to sampling variability inherent in the randomization process, the actual counts in each experimental cell will be distributed about the expected sample size for each experimental cell. Within the Surveycraft CAI questionnaire for the 1997 NES Pilot, the random assignment of group order and threat level was determined by a call to an internal system random number generator. Examination of the final sample size distribution across the cells of this experimental question module suggests significant departures from the equal sample size per cell assumption. Specifically, there appears to be a problem in the randomization
assignment for group order and threat level. Table 1 compares the expected and actual distributions of 1997 NES Pilot sample to experimental cells:

Table 1
1997 NES Pilot Section J Question Experiment. Expected and Actual Distribution of Respondents to Treatment Categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Group Order</th>
<th>Threat Level</th>
<th>Expected Respondents</th>
<th>Actual Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Series</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Fundamentalists</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second series</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Fundamentalists</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Through analysis of actual random numbers generated in the course of the 1997 NES Pilot computer-assisted interviews and communication with the authors of Surveycraft, the randomization problem has been traced to Surveycraft's handling of random number seeds in sequential calls of the random number function. Our review finds that the initial random number draws to determine the target group for the first question sequence were performed correctly. Observed variation in numbers of cases assigned at random to the African-American (n=297) and Christian Fundamentalists (n=255) target group question order are due to sampling error in the random draws of binomial (0,1) indicator variables. Since the random draws to determine threat level in the first and second question sequences are correlated with this initial random draw they also are pure random numbers (albeit not independent of the initial draw). The randomization of the experiment is therefore not affected by the problem—the joint probability that a respondent receives a particular configuration of experimental treatments is independent of respondent characteristics or the sample design. Unfortunately, the correlated sequence of random numbers does affect the balance of the distribution of subjects to the experimental design cells. This will have an unspecified, but negative effect on the power to detect effects of target group ordering and threat level that are the object of the factorial experimental design.

The third factor in the experimental design, random ordering of each question representing a threat domain, was performed by a separate Surveycraft internal function. To the best of our ability to test the mechanism, this dimension of the experiment appears free of the randomization problem identified for the group order and threat level experimental conditions.

ISR/SRC has corrected the problem which created this situation, working with Surveycraft authors to identify programming changes and conventions that now permit independent random number sequence generation directly within the system. Random numbers to determine assignments to experimental treatment in question sequences were drawn in advance, tested for independence and preloaded for use by the interviewing application. These simulations
demonstrated that sequences of independent random assignments to treatments are now functioning within the SRC Surveycraft CATI system.
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>> MASTER CODE
CAMPAIGN ISSUES

001 "Domestic issues"
006 Child care; DAY CARE; child support
045 ABORTION; any reference
010 UNEMPLOYMENT, jobs, retraining -- general or national
011 Unemployment, lack of jobs in specific area/region/state/industry
012 More help for the unemployed
020 EDUCATION -- any mention, including quality of schools, cost of college, students not learning anything
030 AGED/ELDERLY -- any mention, including Social Security, Medicare, eldercare.
040 HEALTH PROBLEMS -- quality of medical care, cost of medical care, availability of medical care, catastrophic health insurance (except AIDS, code 048)
048 AIDS
050 HOUSING -- providing housing for the poor, the homeless, young people can't buy homes, any mention.
055 INFRASTRUCTURE -- Build/maintain roads, bridges, railroads, mass transit systems; transportation - NFS "POVERTY" has the general thrust of helping the underprivileged; the 'welfare' code 090 may have connotation of undeserving people on welfare. Thus, 'do more for people on welfare' is a 060 rather than 90. WELFARE --NFS is a 090.
060 POVERTY; aid to poor, underprivileged people; help for the (truly) needy; general reference to anti-poverty programs; hunger/help for hungry people
090 SOCIAL WELFARE; "Welfare"; the welfare mess, too many undeserving on welfare
099 OTHER SPECIFIC MENTIONS OF DOMESTIC ISSUES

100 Problems of the FARMERS; farm bankruptcies, poor
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prices for crops, effects of the drought
150 Protecting the ENVIRONMENT, POLLUTION, the ozone layer, the greenhouse effect.
151 Controlling/REGULATING GROWTH or land development; banning further growth/development in crowded or ecologically sensitive areas; preserving natural areas
154 TOXIC WASTE, RADIOACTIVE WASTE
160 Need to develop ALTERNATIVE ENERGY SOURCES
199 Other specific mentions of AGRICULTURE or ENVIRONMENT problems

........................................

300 CIVIL RIGHTS/RACIAL PROBLEMS; affirmative action programs; relations between blacks and whites
310 WOMEN'S ISSUES -- ERA, equal pay for equal work, maternity leave (except day care, code 006)
320 DRUGS -- extent of drug use in U.S; "WAR ON DRUGS"; drugs--NFS; ALCOHOLISM, any mention
321 DRUGS -- stopping drugs from coming into this country
340 CRIME/VIOLENCE; streets aren't safe; respect for police; releasing criminals early; not enough jails; death penalty
367 GUN CONTROL - all mentions
370 EXTREMIST GROUPS/TERRORISTS
380 General mention of MORALITY/TRADITIONAL VALUES; sex, bad language, pornography, teenage pregnancy
381 Specific mention of FAMILY VALUES -- latchkey children, divorce; unwed mothers, working mothers
382 Homosexual/gay rights; gays in the military [code 048 for mentions of AIDS]
384 RELIGION (too mixed up in) and politics; prayer in schools
399 OTHER MENTION of race, public order, morality

........................................

400 INFLATION, high prices, cost of living
405 WAGES TOO LOW; minimum wage
408 Recession/Depression in specific industries, states or regions -- slump in OIL/STEEL/AUTO INDUSTRY, etc. (except farm, code 101); hard times in this REGION or area
410 RECESSION; DEPRESSION, hard times -- no specific locale or industry
415 THE DEFICIT; BALANCING THE BUDGET; cutting government spending
416 TAXES -- any reference; tax reform
425 TOO MANY IMPORTS -- protectionism, competition, outsourcing, problems of auto industry relating to foreign competition; U.S. makes (too) few exports; (high) tariffs imposed by other nations; free trade; GATT
427 VALUE OF THE DOLLAR -- strengthening or weakening
428 STOCK MARKETS; investments; interest rates
440 CLASS ORIENTED ECONOMIC CONCERNS -- middle class getting squeezed; big business too powerful
453 Solvency/stability/regulation/control of the nation's FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS. [1990] Savings and Loan scandals
460 IMMIGRATION
ECONOMICS, THE ECONOMY
BALANCE OF TRADE; balance of payments; foreign oil dependency (except supply of oil, see 524)
OTHER MENTION of economic, business or labor problems

FOREIGN POLICY; FOREIGN AFFAIRS
LATIN AMERICA, Central America, AID TO CONTRAS (reference to IRAN-CONTRA coded 816)
AFRICA -- starving people, overpopulation
SOUTH AFRICA -- Apartheid
MIDDLE EAST -- Iran hostages, Persian Gulf, supply of mid-east oil (except oil dependency, see 493)
RUSSIA -- relations with, arms talks, detente; summit, etc.
FIRMNESS in foreign policy
U.S. military involvement abroad
FOREIGN AID; amount of money given to foreign countries; obligation to take care of our problems at home first
AVOID WAR, establish PEACE -- any reference
DEFENSE (SPENDING); the military; quality/cost of weapons
NUCLEAR ARMS RACE -- disarmament, SALT, INF, threat of nuclear war; arms control
STAR WARS
SPACE PROGRAM

Honesty, sincerity of government officials; corruption
Honesty, sincerity of candidates in general; e.g., "just making promises," "saying whatever it takes to get elected"
Candidates are just talking (negatively) about each other, MUD SLINGING.
How well incumbent represents/candidate would REPRESENT THIS DISTRICT
Congressperson's personal life/morality
Candidate's ABILITY/EXPERIENCE
Candidate's (voting) RECORD
PRESIDENT CLINTON
BUSH and the IRAN-CONTRA affair
IRAN-CONTRA affair, mess, scandal, IRAN ARMS DEAL, without reference to Bush
Which party will control the House of Representatives; other partisan mentions
Need for change/new blood/fresh ideas in Congress; term limits for members of Congress
PHILOSOPHICAL DIFFERENCES between the candidates -- liberal vs. conservative views; balance of authority between state and federal government; etc.
A local issue or concern -- the college, the dam, the auto-insurance initiative, the leak in our nuclear plant
1992: OTHER SPECIFIC MENTIONS OF CAMPAIGN ISSUES
1990: "There were no issues" (except 996); just party politics
1990: OTHER SPECIFIC MENTIONS OF CAMPAIGN ISSUES
1992 CODES (PART ONE)
R Pays No Attention To Political Ads

001 R claims not to remember what the ads s/he saw were about - NFS says only "nothing", "very little/not much", "can't remember", "don't recall", etc. without further explanation or elaboration).

002 R deliberately and actively avoids watching political ads (I hit the mute button/change the channel; I go to the refrigerator, etc.).

003 R does watch the political ads but indicates s/he chooses to pay no attention to them (I don't pay much attention, they don't register on my mind, goes in one ear and out the other, I just laugh at them, I'm immune to them).

R GIVE GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF POLITICAL ADS (NO CANDIDATE SPECIFIED)

010 AMOUNT/FREQUENCY OF ADS - too many of them; they show too many in one evening/time period; see the same ones over and over.

011 PROVIDE NO INFORMATION/SERVE NO VALUABLE PURPOSE - too vague/general; not specific (enough); not talking about real/important issues; contain only rhetoric/self-serving promotion/platitudes; point out problems but offer no solutions.

012 PROVIDE INFORMATION/SERVE VALUABLE PURPOSE - talk about (important) issues/candidate's stands on issues; try to present solutions to issues; are enlightening; treat voters like grown-ups.

013 DISHONEST/MISLEADING - (too) deceitful; tell lies/half-truths/only the facts that help them; try to confuse/hide/avoid the issues; say only what they think the voter wants to hear.

014 HONEST/STRAIGHT-FORWARD - tells the truth; presents the (real) facts/all the facts; tries to clarify/face the issues; they make sense.

015 NEGATIVE CAMPAIGNING - (too negative); (too much) backbiting/mudslinging; only try to tear opponents down/make personal attacks on opponent.

016 POSITIVE CAMPAIGNING - doesn't make personal attacks on opponent; talk about the candidate/why the candidate should be elected.

017 HAD NEGATIVE EFFECT ON R - made R angry/disgusted; destroyed R's interest in politics/the election; R finds them boring; R is tired of seeing them.

018 HAD POSITIVE EFFECT ON R - helped R understand the candidate/issues; helped R decide who to vote for.

028 OTHER POSITIVE GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF POLITICAL ADS (NO CANDIDATE SPECIFIED)
R GIVES GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF BUSH POLITICAL ADS

030 AMOUNT/FREQUENCY OF BUSH ADS - too many of them; they show too many in one evening/time period; see the same ones over and over.

031 BUSH ADS PROVIDE NO INFORMATION/SERVE NO VALUABLE PURPOSE - too vague/general; not specific (enough); not talking about real/important issues; contain only rhetoric/self-serving promotion/platitudes; point out problems but offer no solutions.

032 BUSH ADS PROVIDE INFORMATION/SERVE VALUABLE PURPOSE - talk about (important) issues/candidate's stands on issues; try to present solutions to issues; are enlightening; treat voters like grown-ups.

033 BUSH ADS DISHONEST/MISLEADING - (too) deceitful; tell lies/half-truths/only the facts that help them; try to confuse/hide/avoid the issues; say only what they think the voter wants to hear.

034 BUSH ADS HONEST/STRaight-FORward - tells the truth; presents the (real) facts/all the facts; tries to clarify/face the issues; they make sense.

035 NEGATIVE CAMPAIGNING BY BUSH - (too negative); (too much) backbiting/mudslinging; only try to tear opponents down/make personal attacks on opponent.

036 POSITIVE CAMPAIGNING BY BUSH - doesn't make personal attacks on opponent; talk about the candidate/why the candidate should be elected.

037 BUSH ADS HAD NEGATIVE EFFECT ON R - made R angry/disgusted; destroyed R's interest in politics/the election; R finds them boring; R is tired of seeing them.

038 BUSH ADS HAD POSITIVE EFFECT ON R - helped R understand the candidate/issuE; helped R decide who to vote for.

039 R REFUSES TO LISTEN TO/WATCH BUSH ADS SPECIFICALLY

048 OTHER POSITIVE GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF BUSH POLITICAL ADS

049 OTHER NEGATIVE GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF BUSH POLITICAL ADS

R GIVES GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF CLINTON POLITICAL ADS

050 AMOUNT/FREQUENCY OF CLINTON ADS - too many of them; they show too many in one evening/time period; see the same ones over and over.

051 CLINTON ADS PROVIDE NO INFORMATION/SERVE NO VALUABLE PURPOSE - too vague/general; not specific (enough); not talking about real/important issues; contain only rhetoric/self-serving promotion/platitudes; point out problems but offer no solutions.

052 CLINTON ADS PROVIDE INFORMATION/SERVE VALUABLE
PURPOSE - talk about (important) issues/candidate's stands on issues; try to present solutions to issues; are enlightening; treat voters like grown-ups.

053 CLINTON ADS DISHonest/MISleading - (too) deceitful; tell lies/half-truths/only the facts that help them; try to confuse/hide/avoid the issues; say only what they think the voter wants to hear.

054 CLINTON ADS HONEST/Straight-forward - tells the truth; presents the (real) facts/all the facts; tries to clarify/face the issues; they make sense.

055 NEGATIVE CAMPAIGNING BY CLINTON - (too negative); (too much) backbiting/mudslinging; only try to tear opponents down/make personal attacks on opponent.

056 POSITIVE CAMPAIGNING BY CLINTON - doesn't make personal attacks on opponent; talk about the candidate/why the candidate should be elected.

057 CLINTON ADS HAD NEGATIVE EFFECT ON R - made R angry/disgusted; destroyed R's interest in politics/the election; R finds them boring; R is tired of seeing them.

058 CLINTON ADS HAD POSITIVE EFFECT ON R - helped R understand the candidate/issues; helped R decide who to vote for.

059 R refuses to listen to/watch Clinton ads specifically

068 OTHER POSITIVE GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF Clinton political ads

069 OTHER NEGATIVE GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF Clinton political ads

R GIVES GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF PERot political ads

070 AMOUNT/frequency of PERot ads - too many of them; they show too many in one evening/time period; see the same ones over and over.

071 PERot ADS PROVIDE no INFORMATION/serve no Valuable purpose - too vague/general; not specific (enough); not talking about real/important issues; contain only rhetoric/self-serving promotion/platitudes; point out problems but offer no solutions.

072 PERot ADS PROVIDE INFORMATION/serve valuable purpose - talk about (important) issues/candidate's stands on issues; try to present solutions to issues; are enlightening; treat voters like grown-ups.

073 PERot ADS DISHonest/MISleading - (too) deceitful; tell lies/half-truths/only the facts that help them; try to confuse/hide/avoid the issues; say only what they think the voter wants to hear.

074 PERot ADS HONEST/Straight-forward - tells the truth; presents the (real) facts/all the facts; tries to clarify/face the issues; they make sense.

075 NEGATIVE CAMPAIGNING BY PERot - (too negative); (too much) backbiting/mudslinging; only try to tear opponents down/make personal attacks on
076 POSITIVE CAMPAIGNING BY PEROT - doesn't make personal attacks on opponent; talk about the candidate/why the candidate should be elected.

077 PEROT ADS HAD NEGATIVE EFFECT ON R - made R angry/disgusted; destroyed R's interest in politics/the election; R finds them boring; R is tired of seeing them.

078 PEROT ADS HAD POSITIVE EFFECT ON R - helped R understand the candidate/issues; helped R decide who to vote for.

079 R refuses to listen to/watch Perot ads specifically

088 Other positive general assessment of Perot political ads

089 Other negative general assessment of Perot political ads

R IDENTIFIES SPECIFIC BUSH POLITICAL ADS

130 Bush ad - no other details given.

131 Bush ad - no content given, but production details remembered (e.g., closeup of face, sitting on edge of desk, it was green).

132 Bush ad - "Two Faces of Clinton"/Time magazine cover highlighting two faces.

133 Bush ad - computer ad.

134 Bush ad - on Bush's record in general.

135 Bush ad - attacking Clinton's record in Arkansas.

136 Bush ad - on Clinton's draft record/anti-American activities.

137 Bush ad - about taxes; saying Bush won't raise taxes (again).

138 Bush ad - about Bush's economic plan/promises for the economy.

139 Bush ad - Florida relief; giving food to poor countries; Bush portrayed as a caring person.

140 Bush ad - family values; families coming together; Bush portrayed as a family man.

141 Bush ad - foreign policy accomplishments of the Bush administration; Bush shown as commander-in-chief.

142 Bush ad - needs four more years to finish the job.

143 Bush ad - clips from the Republican convention.

144 Bush ad - average people questioning Clinton's willingness and ability to keep his promised.

149 Bush ad - other

R IDENTIFIES SPECIFIC CLINTON POLITICAL ADS

150 Clinton ad - no other details given.

151 Clinton ad - no content given, but production details remembered (e.g., closeup of face, waving to crowd, flag in background).

152 Clinton ad - attacking Bush's broken promise not to raise taxes; "read my lips -- no new taxes".

153 Clinton ad - attacking Bush's handling of the economy; "we can't afford four more years". 
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154    Clinton ad - about creating jobs/putting people back to work.
155    Clinton ad - about the need for change; about rebuilding America/putting American on the right course.
156    Clinton ad - defending Clinton's record in Arkansas/record on taxes as governor.
157    Clinton ad - reforming welfare.
158    Clinton ad - showing working people.
159    Clinton ad - defending Clinton's draft record.
160    Clinton ad - giving address to write to for Clinton's economic plan; experts endorsing Clinton's economic plan.
169    Clinton ad - other

R IDENTIFIES SPECIFIC PEROT POLITICAL ADS

170    Perot ad - no other details given.
171    Perot ad - no content given, but production details remembered (e.g., sitting behind a desk, scroll with writing, 30 minutes long).
172    Perot ad - used a lot of charts and graphs.
173    Perot ad - describing in general terms problems with the economy/the deficit.
174    Perot ad - detailed how the deficit would affect future generations.
175    Perot ad - plans/promises to solve America's problems.
176    Perot ad - Purple Heart ad
189    Perot ad - other

R IDENTIFIES A SPECIFIC EVENT THAT WAS NOT A PRESIDENTIAL POLITICAL AD

190    Other - R describes a new event that clearly was not part of a political ad (e.g., Quayle talking about Murphy Brown; Mary Matalin talking about Hillary Clinton).
191    Other - R describes a political ad, but one for a congressional, state or local candidate or one concerning a controversial issue (e.g., abortion, gay rights, etc.).

MISCELLANEOUS

997    Other, miscellaneous
998    DK (except 001-003)
999    NA

1996 CODES (PART TWO)

NOTE: The codes for political ads used in 1996 are different from the coding scheme used for political ads in 1992. As a result of experience with and recommendations about the wording of political ad questions in 1992, the Board of Overseers approved a different means of asking about recall of political advertisements in the 1996 NES. Two important differences set 1996 apart from 1992. One is that the question in 1996 asks the respondent to focus on recall of a single specific ad, the one you ad remember best'. In 1992 the question
asked about "what do you remember about any of these ads"— in the plural. Second, in 1992 the question concerned Presidential ads while in 1996 the questions did not restrict respondents to Presidential ads,. Thus the coding scheme for 1996, while developed from and similar to that of 1992, is not the same. Differing coding categories exist (specific ads mentioned in 1992 of course have no relevance in 1996) and the frequencies for similar or repeated categories are also different. The effort in 1996 was to code accurately the open-ended responses received in 1996 while producing codes that could be aggregated in ways that facilitate some kinds of comparisons between 1992 and 1996.

R Pays No Attention To Political Ads

001 R claims not to remember what the ads s/he saw were about – NFS says only "nothing", "very little/not much", "can't remember", "don't recall", etc. without further explanation or elaboration).

002 R deliberately and actively avoids watching political ads (I hit the mute button/change the channel; I go to the refrigerator, etc.)

003 R does watch the political ads but indicates s/he chooses to pay no attention to them (I don't pay much attention, they don't register on my mind, goes in one ear and out the other, I just laugh at them, I'm immune to them).

R GIVE GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF POLITICAL ADS
(NO CANDIDATE SPECIFIED)

010 AMOUNT/FREQUENCY OF ADS - too many of them; they show too many in one evening/time period; see the same ones over and over.

011 PROVIDE NO INFORMATION/SERVE NO VALUABLE PURPOSE - too vague/general; not specific (enough); not talking about real/important issues; contain only rhetoric/self-serving promotion/platitudes; point out problems but offer no solutions.

012 PROVIDE INFORMATION/SERVE VALUABLE PURPOSE - talk about (important)issues/candidate's stands on issues; try to present solutions to issues; are enlightening; treat voters like grown-ups.

013 DISHONEST/MISLEADING - (too) deceitful; tell lies/half-truths/only the facts that help them; try to confuse/hide/avoid the issues; say only what they think the voter wants to hear.

014 HONEST/STRAIGHT-FORWARD - tells the truth; presents the (real)facts/all the facts; tries to clarify-face the issues; they make sense.

015 NEGATIVE CAMPAIGNING - (too negative); (too much)backbiting/mudslinging; only try to tear opponents down/make personal attacks on opponent.

016 POSITIVE CAMPAIGNING - doesn't make personal attacks on opponent; talk about the candidate/why the candidate should be elected.

017 HAD NEGATIVE EFFECT ON R - made R angry/disgusted; destroyed R's interest in politics/the election; R finds them boring; R is tired of seeing them.

018 HAD POSITIVE EFFECT ON R - helped R understand the candidate/issues; helped R decide who to vote for.

028 OTHER POSITIVE GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF POLITICAL ADS (NO CANDIDATE SPECIFIED)
029 OTHER NEGATIVE GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF POLITICAL ADS (NO CANDIDATE SPECIFIED)

R GIVES GENERAL ASSESSMENT/DESCRIBES
GENERAL FEATURE(S) OF DOLE POLITICAL AD(S)

030 AMOUNT/FREQUENCY OF DOLE ADS - too many of them; they show too many in one evening/time period; see the same ones over and over.

031 DOLE ADS PROVIDE NO INFORMATION/SERVE NO VALUABLE PURPOSE - too vague/general; not specific (enough); not talking about real/important issues; contain only rhetoric/self-serving promotion/platitudes; point out problems but offer no solutions.

032 DOLE ADS PROVIDE INFORMATION/SERVE VALUABLE PURPOSE - talk about (important) issues/candidate's stands on issues; try to present solutions to issues; are enlightening; treat voters like grown-ups.

033 DOLE ADS Dishonest/Misleading - (too) deceitful; tell lies/half-truths/only the facts that help them; try to confuse/hide/avoid the issues; say only what they think the voter wants to hear.

034 DOLE ADS Honest/Straight-forward - tells the truth; presents the (real) facts/all the facts; tries to clarify face the issues; they make sense.

035 Negative campaigning by dole - (too negative); (too much) backbiting/mudslinging; only try to tear opponents down/make personal attacks on opponent.

036 Positive campaigning by dole - doesn't make personal attacks on opponent; talk about the candidate/why the candidate should be elected.

037 DOLE ADS HAD NEGATIVE EFFECT ON R - made R angry/disgusted; destroyed R's interest in politics/the election; R finds them boring; R is tired of seeing them.

038 DOLE ADS HAD POSITIVE EFFECT ON R - helped R understand the candidate/issues; helped R decide who to vote for.

039 R REFUSES TO LISTEN TO/WATCH DOLE ADS SPECIFICALLY

040 DOLE AD NEGATIVE RE: CLINTON NFS (badmouthing/downside of' Clinton)

048 OTHER POSITIVE GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF DOLE POLITICAL ADS

049 OTHER NEGATIVE GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF DOLE POLITICAL ADS

R GIVES GENERAL ASSESSMENT/DESCRIBES
GENERAL FEATURE(S) OF CLINTON POLITICAL AD(S)

050 AMOUNT/FREQUENCY OF CLINTON ADS - too many of them; they show too many in one evening/time period; see the same ones over and over.

051 CLINTON ADS PROVIDE NO INFORMATION/SERVE NO VALUABLE PURPOSE - too vague/general; not specific (enough); not talking about real/important issues; contain only rhetoric/self-serving promotion/platitudes; point out problems but offer no solutions.

052 CLINTON ADS PROVIDE INFORMATION/SERVE VALUABLE PURPOSE - talk about (important) issues/candidate's stands on issues; try to present solutions to issues; are enlightening; treat voters like grown-ups.

053 CLINTON ADS Dishonest/Misleading - (too) deceitful; tell
lies/half-truths/only the facts that help them; try to confuse/hide/avoid the issues; say only what they think the voter wants to hear.

054 CLINTON ADS HONEST/STRAIGHT-FORWARD - tells the truth; presents the (real) facts/all the facts; tries to clarify/face the issues; they make sense.

055 NEGATIVE CAMPAIGNING BY CLINTON - (too negative); (too much) backbiting/mudslinging; only try to tear opponents down/make personal attacks on opponent.

056 POSITIVE CAMPAIGNING BY CLINTON - doesn't make personal attacks on opponent; talk about the candidate/why the candidate should be elected.

057 CLINTON ADS HAD NEGATIVE EFFECT ON R - made R angry/disgusted; destroyed R's interest in politics/the election; R finds them boring; R is tired of seeing them.

058 CLINTON ADS HAD POSITIVE EFFECT ON R - helped R understand the candidate/issues; helped R decide who to vote for.

059 R REFUSES TO LISTEN TO/WATCH CLINTON ADS SPECIFICALLY

060 NEGATIVE RE: DOLE, NFS

068 OTHER POSITIVE GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF CLINTON POLITICAL ADS

069 OTHER NEGATIVE GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF CLINTON POLITICAL ADS

R GIVES GENERAL ASSESSMENT/DESCRIBES GENERAL FEATURE(S) OF PEROT POLITICAL AD(S)

070 AMOUNT/FREQUENCY OF PEROT ADS - too many of them; they show too many in one evening/time period; see the same ones over and over.

071 PEROT ADS PROVIDE NO INFORMATION/SERVE NO VALUABLE PURPOSE - too vague/general; not specific (enough); not talking about real/important issues; contain only rhetoric/self-serving promotion/platitudes; point out problems but offer no solutions.

072 PEROT ADS PROVIDE INFORMATION/SERVE VALUABLE PURPOSE - talk about (important) issues/candidate's stands on issues; try to present solutions to issues; are enlightening; treat voters like grown-ups.

073 PEROT ADS DISHONEST/MISLEADING - (too) deceitful; tell lies/half-truths/only the facts that help them; try to confuse/hide/avoid the issues; say only what they think the voter wants to hear.

074 PEROT ADS HONEST/STRAIGHT-FORWARD - tells the truth; presents the (real) facts/all the facts; tries to clarify/face the issues; they make sense.

075 NEGATIVE CAMPAIGNING BY PEROT - (too negative); (too much) backbiting/mudslinging; only try to tear opponents down/make personal attacks on opponent.

076 POSITIVE CAMPAIGNING BY PEROT - doesn't make personal attacks on opponent; talk about the candidate/why the candidate should be elected.

077 PEROT ADS HAD NEGATIVE EFFECT ON R - made R angry/disgusted; destroyed R's interest in politics/the election; R finds them boring; R is tired of seeing them.

078 PEROT ADS HAD POSITIVE EFFECT ON R - helped R understand the candidate/issues; helped R decide who to vote for.

079 R refuses to listen to/watch Perot ads specifically

088 Other positive general assessment of Perot political ads

089 Other negative general assessment of Perot political ads
Dole ad - no other details given ("I know it was Dole's ad")
Dole ad - production details described (showed him in black and white, he was talking to some women)
Dole ad - 15% tax cut, would let people keep more of what they earn (i.e. would cut taxes)
Dole ad - war injuries, military service record
Dole ad - Russell KS values and community, personal history/life story (other than military record)
Dole ad - Dole's position on Medicare cuts
Dole ad - mention of Kemp
Dole ad - attacking Clinton for largest tax hike in history', criticizing Clinton for apologizing for raising taxes, general/other negative on Clinton's tax record
Dole ad - attacking Clinton re: Whitewater
Dole ad - attacking Clinton re: ethics of White House staff and cabinet
Dole ad - attacking Clinton re: immigration and border patrol
Dole ad - attacks Clinton as a liar-NFS; Clinton changes what he says from one time to the next; Clinton's inconsistencies; doesn't keep/breaks promises
Dole ad - Attacks Clinton re: drug policies, teen drug use going up, budget cuts for drug enforcement, Clinton on MTV re: pot use
Dole ad - Attacks Clinton re: family values
Dole ad - Attacks Clinton as a liberal, closet liberal; shows Clinton saying 'I'm not a liberal'
Dole ad - other negative re: Clinton
Dole ad - other specifics

Clinton ad - no other details given
Clinton ad - production details described
Clinton ad - describing his stance on family values.
Clinton ad - describing the achievements of his first term in office
Clinton ad - describing his record on employment, jobs
Clinton ad - reforms welfare, makes jobs for unemployed/people on welfare
Clinton ad - saying Clinton makes up his own mind, is a leader
Clinton ad - Clinton's efforts on drugs; Dole criticisms wrong/unfair; appt. of drug czar; policies and funding to combat drugs
Clinton ad - Clinton's record on [illegal] immigration
Clinton ad - Clinton doing right on elderly health care, positive Record on Medicare
Clinton ad - supports education, supports student loan pgms, supports reading pgms
Clinton ad - support of issues affecting children (other than drug policy or education)
Clinton ad - record on gun control, puts more cops on streets, endorsed by police, tough on crime (excludes any drug-related--see 157)
Clinton ad - Other positive, not coded elsewhere
Clinton ad - compares Clinton's record favorably w/Dole's on multiple issues
Clinton ad - attacking Dole's stance on social security
Clinton ad - attacking Dole's position on school lunch, other
children's issues, on education

173 Clinton ad - attacking Dole's Medicare voting record
174 Clinton ad - attacking Dole re: his comments on cigarettes, support of tobacco industry
175 Clinton ad - Attacking Dole's tax cut proposal
176 Clinton ad - negative attack on Dole/Gingrich
177 Clinton ad-neg re: Dole's voting record: wrong for the past, wrong for the future'
179 Clinton ad discussing Dole--NFS, other
169 Clinton ad - other specifics

R DESCRIBES SPECIFIC PEROT POLITICAL AD(S)

180 Perot ad - no other details given.
181 Perot ad - production details described
182 Perot ad - used a lot of charts and graphs.
183 Perot ad - describing problems with the economy/the deficit/the budget, Perot will drop our taxes.
184 Perot ad - doesn't take special interest' money; not beholden to special interests
185 Perot ad - he'll abolish the IRS
186 Perot ad - announcing his candidacy (I'm back'); announcing his VP candidate
187 Perot ad - re: not being in debates
189 Perot ad - other specifics

R DESCRIBES A SPECIFIC EVENT THAT WAS NOT A POLITICAL AD

190 R describes a news event that clearly was not part of a political ad; mentions watching the convention or seeing a candidate on a news program or during debates.

CANDIDATE NAMED IS NOT MAJOR PRESIDENTIAL Candidate (INCLUDES STATE AND LOCAL RACES)

191 R describes a political ad, but one for a congressional, state or local candidate

R DESCRIBES OTHER ADS: CANDIDATE NOT ASCERTAINED/AD SPONSOR NOT ELSEWHERE IDENTIFIED

192 R describes ad concerning a specific issue (e.g. Medicare, abortion, gay rights, etc.).

R IDENTIFIES AD AS BEING BY THE DEMOCRATS' (NOT ASSOCIATED W/ SPECIFIC CANDIDATE)

301-General positive about Democrats/Democratic candidates, NFS
302-Negative towards the Republicans
397-Other

R IDENTIFIES AD AS BEING BY THE REPUBLICANS' (NOT ASSOCIATED W/ SPECIFIC CANDIDATE)

401-General positive about republicans/Republican candidates, NFS
402-Negative towards the Democrats
497-Other

DON'T RECALL CANDIDATE, NO SPECIFIC CANDIDATE BUT AD
DESCRIPTION
MENTIONS CLINTON, DOLE or BOTH

Clinton:
502 positive about Clinton: other and NFS
503 Clinton and taxes
504 Clinton and pot
505 negative about Clinton: other, NFS
506 names Clinton

Dole:
520 negative about Dole's past political stands, Dole's voting record
521 Dole and taxes; the budget/finances, will help the little people on
taxes
523 Dole general, other, NFS
524 Dole, recalls production details
525 Dole in WWII, injuries
526 negative towards Dole other, nfs, general

Both Clinton and Dole:
598 R mentions both Clinton and Dole, general, other, NFS
599 Dole and Clinton contradict each other

MISCELLANEOUS

996 Miscellaneous production details recalled
997 Other, miscellaneous
998 DK
999 NA

>> MASTER CODE
CANDIDATE NUMBER

SENATE:
10 Third party or independent Senate candidate **
11 Democratic candidate in open Senate race
12 Republican candidate in open Senate race
13 Democratic Senate incumbent
14 Republican Senate incumbent
15 Democratic Senate challenger
16 Republican Senate challenger
17 Democratic Senator, no race in state
18 Republican Senator, no race in state
19 Democratic Senator, term not up in state with race
21 Democratic Senator--retiring (state with open race)
22 Republican Senator--retiring (state with open race)
27 Democratic Senator, no race in state
28 Republican Senator, no race in state
29 Republican Senator, term not up in state with race

HOUSE:
30 Third party or independent House candidate **
31 Democratic candidate in open House race
Republican candidate in open House race
Democratic House incumbent
Republican House incumbent
Democratic House challenger
Republican House challenger
Democratic Representative--retiring (district with open race)
Republican Representative--retiring (district with open race)

GOVERNOR:
[NOT USED 1992 and 1996]
Third party or independent Gubernatorial candidate **
Democratic candidate in open Gubernatorial race
Republican candidate in open Gubernatorial race
Democratic Gubernatorial incumbent
Republican Gubernatorial incumbent
Democratic Gubernatorial challenger
Republican Gubernatorial challenger
Democratic governor, no race in state
Republican governor, no race in state
Democratic governor--retiring (state with open race)
Republican governor--retiring (state with open race)

OTHER:
Both Democratic and Republican candidates (used in incumbency var only)
Name given not on Candidate List

MISSING DATA:
DK; refused to name candidate
NA
INAP

++VOTED OUTSIDE DISTRICT OF IW:

DISTRICT WITH NO RUNNING INCUMBENT: (VOTE VAR ONLY)
Democratic candidate
Republican candidate

DISTRICT WITH RUNNING INCUMBENT: (VOTE VAR ONLY)
Democratic incumbent
Republican incumbent
Democratic challenger
Republican challenger

ALL DISTRICTS: (VOTE VAR ONLY)
Third party or independent candidate **
Democrat--no name given
Republican--no name given

** IF 3RD PARTY/INDEPENDENT CANDIDATE NAMED, THIS CODE IS USED ONLY IF NAME APPEARS ON CANDIDATE LIST (IF NAME NOT ON CANDIDATE LIST, CODE 97 IS USED).

NOTE: CODE 97 INCLUDES INSTANCES WHERE R VOTED STRAIGHT MAJOR PARTY TICKET BUT NO CANDIDATE FOR R'S PARTY RAN FOR GIVEN OFFICE (OR: R INSISTS VOTED FOR A MAJOR PARTY'S CANDIDATE BUT NO CANDIDATE RAN FOR GIVEN OFFICE REPRESENTING NAMED MAJOR PARTY).
++ CODES 80-86,91,92 ARE NOT USED IN VARS OTHER THAN VOTE VARS.

GENERAL NOTE: IN THOSE QUESTIONS WHERE R IS NOT READ NAMES OF CANDIDATES BUT R SUPPLIES A CANDIDATE NAME OF HIS/HER OWN CONSTRUCTION [I.E., IN RECALL, 'MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM IN DISTRICT' HOUSE CANDIDATE], RESPONDENTS SOMETIMES IN ERROR GIVE NAMES OF CANDIDATES FOR OTHER OFFICES OR NAMES OF NONRUNNING OFFICEHOLDERS. IF SUCH A NAME IS DETERMINED TO BE APPROPRIATE FOR R'S STATE/CD AND THE NAME IS CODEABLE FROM THE CANDIDATE LIST USED, WHEREVER POSSIBLE THE 'INCORRECT' NAME IS STILL CODED. (However, see ** for 3rd/party and independent candidates). [NOTE: If R names candidates from districts other than district corresponding to R's sample location, those candidates' codes are not coded--97 is used.]

>> MASTER CODE

BALLOT CARDS AND CANDIDATE LISTS

CANDIDATE LISTS AND BALLOT CARDS - 1992

STATE: Alabama  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 03
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
   13. Richard C. Shelby          Democratic incumbent
   16. Richard Sellers            Republican challenger
   19. Howell T. Heflin           Democratic--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
   33. Glen Browder               Democratic incumbent
   36. Don Sledge                 Republican challenger

============================================================

STATE: Alabama  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 04
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
   13. Richard C. Shelby          Democratic incumbent
   16. Richard Sellers            Republican challenger
   19. Howell T. Heflin           Democratic--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
   33. Tom Bevill                 Democratic incumbent
   36. Mickey Strickland          Republican challenger

============================================================

STATE: Alabama  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 06
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
   13. Richard C. Shelby          Democratic incumbent
   16. Richard Sellers            Republican challenger
   19. Howell T. Heflin           Democratic--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
   33. Ben Erdreich               Democratic incumbent
   36. Spencer Bachus             Republican challenger

============================================================

STATE: Alabama  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 07
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
   13. Richard C. Shelby          Democratic incumbent
16. Richard Sellers Republican challenger
19. Howell T. Heflin Democratic--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
31. Earl F. Hilliard Democratic candidate
32. Kervin Jones Republican candidate
41. Claude Harris Jr. Democrat--retiring

============================================================

STATE: Arizona
CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 01

(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
15. Claire Sargent Democratic challenger
14. John McCain Republican incumbent
19. Dennis DeConcini Democratic--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
35. Sam Coppersmith Democratic challenger
34. John "Jay" Rhodes Republican incumbent

============================================================

STATE: Arizona
CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 02

(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
15. Claire Sargent Democratic challenger
14. John McCain Republican incumbent
19. Dennis DeConcini Democratic--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
31. Ed Pastor Democratic candidate
32. Don Shooter Republican candidate
41. Morris K. Udall Democrat--retiring

============================================================

STATE: Arizona
CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 03

(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
15. Claire Sargent Democratic challenger
14. John McCain Republican incumbent
19. Dennis DeConcini Democratic--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
35. Roger Hartstone Democratic challenger
34. Bob Stump Republican incumbent

============================================================

STATE: Arizona
CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 04

(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
15. Claire Sargent Democratic challenger
14. John McCain Republican incumbent
19. Dennis DeConcini Democratic--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
35. Walter Mybeck Democratic challenger
34. Jon Kyl Republican incumbent

============================================================

STATE: Arizona
CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 06

(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
15. Claire Sargent Democratic challenger
14. John McCain Republican incumbent
19. Dennis DeConcini Democratic--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
31. Karan English Democratic candidate
32. Doug Wead Republican candidate

============================================================

STATE: Arkansas
CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 01

(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
13. Dale Bumpers Democratic incumbent
16. Mike Huckabee Republican challenger
19. David Pryor Democratic--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
### Arkansas
#### CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 04

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Dale Bumpers</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mike Huckabee</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>David Pryor</td>
<td>Democratic--term not up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 04

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Bill McCuen</td>
<td>Democratic candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Jay Dickey</td>
<td>Republican candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Beryl Anthony</td>
<td>Democrat--retiring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### California
#### CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 04

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Barbara Boxer</td>
<td>Democratic candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Bruce Herschensohn</td>
<td>Republican candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a</td>
<td>Dianne Feinstein</td>
<td>Democratic candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14a</td>
<td>John Seymour</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 04

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Patricia Malberg</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>John T. Doolittle</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Barbara Boxer</td>
<td>Democratic candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Bruce Herschensohn</td>
<td>Republican candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a</td>
<td>Dianne Feinstein</td>
<td>Democratic candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14a</td>
<td>John Seymour</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Lynn Woolsey</td>
<td>Democratic candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Bill Filante</td>
<td>Republican candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Barbara Boxer</td>
<td>Democrat--retiring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 07

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Barbara Boxer</td>
<td>Democratic candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Bruce Herschensohn</td>
<td>Republican candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a</td>
<td>Dianne Feinstein</td>
<td>Democratic candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14a</td>
<td>John Seymour</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 07

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>George Miller</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Dave Scholl</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Barbara Boxer</td>
<td>Democratic candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Bruce Herschensohn</td>
<td>Republican candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a</td>
<td>Dianne Feinstein</td>
<td>Democratic candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14a</td>
<td>John Seymour</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Nancy Pelosi</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Marc Wolin</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Barbara Boxer</td>
<td>Democratic candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Bruce Herschensohn</td>
<td>Republican candidate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STATE:  California             CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT:  10
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
  11. Barbara Boxer         Democratic candidate
  12. Bruce Herschensohn    Republican candidate
  11a. Dianne Feinstein     Democratic candidate
  14a. John Seymour         Republican incumbent
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
  33. Ronald V. Dellums     Democratic incumbent
  36. Billy Hunter          Republican challenger

STATE:  California             CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT:  12
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
  11. Barbara Boxer         Democratic candidate
  12. Bruce Herschensohn    Republican candidate
  11a. Dianne Feinstein     Democratic candidate
  14a. John Seymour         Republican incumbent
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
  33. Wendell H. Williams   Democratic candidate
  32. Bill Baker            Republican candidate

STATE:  California             CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT:  13
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
  11. Barbara Boxer         Democratic candidate
  12. Bruce Herschensohn    Republican candidate
  11a. Dianne Feinstein     Democratic candidate
  14a. John Seymour         Republican incumbent
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
  33. Tom Lantos            Democratic incumbent
  36. Jim Tomlin            Republican challenger

STATE:  California             CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT:  19
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
  11. Barbara Boxer         Democratic candidate
  12. Bruce Herschensohn    Republican candidate
  11a. Dianne Feinstein     Democratic candidate
  14a. John Seymour         Republican incumbent
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
  33. Richard H. Lehman     Democratic incumbent
  36. Tal L. Cloud          Republican challenger

STATE:  California             CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT:  24
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
  11. Barbara Boxer         Democratic candidate
  12. Bruce Herschensohn    Republican candidate
  11a. Dianne Feinstein     Democratic candidate
  14a. John Seymour         Republican incumbent
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
  33. Anthony C. Beilenson  Democratic incumbent
  36. Tom McClintock        Republican challenger

STATE:  California             CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT:  26
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
  11. Barbara Boxer         Democratic candidate
  12. Bruce Herschensohn    Republican candidate
  11a. Dianne Feinstein     Democratic candidate
  14a. John Seymour         Republican incumbent
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
  33. Richard H. Lehman     Democratic incumbent
  36. Tal L. Cloud          Republican challenger

STATE:  California
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
  11. Barbara Boxer         Democratic candidate
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12. Bruce Herschensohn Republican candidate  
11a. Dianne Feinstein Democratic candidate  
14a. John Seymour Republican incumbent  

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:  
33. Howard L. Berman Democratic incumbent  
36. Gary Forsch Republican challenger  

============================================================================  
STATE: California CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 27  
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:  
11. Barbara Boxer Democratic candidate  
12. Bruce Herschensohn Republican candidate  
11a. Dianne Feinstein Democratic candidate  
14a. John Seymour Republican incumbent  

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:  
35. Doug Kahn Democratic challenger  
34. Carlos J. Moorhead Republican incumbent  

============================================================================  
STATE: California CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 28  
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:  
11. Barbara Boxer Democratic candidate  
12. Bruce Herschensohn Republican candidate  
11a. Dianne Feinstein Democratic candidate  
14a. John Seymour Republican incumbent  

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:  
35. Al Wachtel Democratic challenger  
34. David Dreier Republican incumbent  

============================================================================  
STATE: California CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 29  
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:  
11. Barbara Boxer Democratic candidate  
12. Bruce Herschensohn Republican candidate  
11a. Dianne Feinstein Democratic candidate  
14a. John Seymour Republican incumbent  

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:  
33. Henry A. Waxman Democratic incumbent  
36. Mark A. Robbins Republican challenger  

============================================================================  
STATE: California CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 31  
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:  
11. Barbara Boxer Democratic candidate  
12. Bruce Herschensohn Republican candidate  
11a. Dianne Feinstein Democratic candidate  
14a. John Seymour Republican incumbent  

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:  
33. Matthew G. Martinez Democratic incumbent  
36. Reuben D. Franco Republican challenger  

============================================================================  
STATE: California CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 32  
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:  
11. Barbara Boxer Democratic candidate  
12. Bruce Herschensohn Republican candidate  
11a. Dianne Feinstein Democratic candidate  
14a. John Seymour Republican incumbent  

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:  
33. Julian C. Dixon Democratic incumbent  

============================================================================  
STATE: California CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 33  
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:  
11. Barbara Boxer Democratic candidate  
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12. Bruce Herschensohn Republican candidate
11a. Dianne Feinstein Democratic candidate
14a. John Seymour Republican incumbent

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
31. Lucille Roybal-Allard Democratic candidate
32. Robert Guzman Republican candidate

============================================================
STATE: California CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 34
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
11. Barbara Boxer Democratic candidate
12. Bruce Herschensohn Republican candidate
11a. Dianne Feinstein Democratic candidate
14a. John Seymour Republican incumbent

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. Esteban E. Torres Democratic incumbent
36. J. "Jay" Hernandez Republican challenger

============================================================
STATE: California CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 35
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
11. Barbara Boxer Democratic candidate
12. Bruce Herschensohn Republican candidate
11a. Dianne Feinstein Democratic candidate
14a. John Seymour Republican incumbent

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. Maxine Waters Democratic incumbent
36. Nate Truman Republican challenger

============================================================
STATE: California CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 36
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
11. Barbara Boxer Democratic candidate
12. Bruce Herschensohn Republican candidate
11a. Dianne Feinstein Democratic candidate
14a. John Seymour Republican incumbent

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
31. Jane Harman Democratic candidate
32. Joan Milke Flores Republican candidate
41. Mel Levine Democrat--retiring

============================================================
STATE: California CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 38
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
11. Barbara Boxer Democratic candidate
12. Bruce Herschensohn Republican candidate
11a. Dianne Feinstein Democratic candidate
14a. John Seymour Republican incumbent

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
31. Evan Anderson Braude Democratic candidate
32. Steve Horn Republican candidate
41. Glenn M. Anderson Democrat--retiring

============================================================
STATE: California CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 39
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
11. Barbara Boxer Democratic candidate
12. Bruce Herschensohn Republican candidate
11a. Dianne Feinstein Democratic candidate
14a. John Seymour Republican incumbent

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
31. Molly McClanahan Democratic candidate
32. Ed Royce Republican candidate
42. William E. Dannemeyer Republican--retiring
STATE: California  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 40
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
11. Barbara Boxer  Democratic candidate
12. Bruce Herschensohn  Republican candidate
11a. Dianne Feinstein  Democratic candidate
14a. John Seymour  Republican incumbent
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
35. Donald M. Rusk  Democratic challenger
34. Jerry L. Lewis  Republican incumbent

STATE: California  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 41
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
11. Barbara Boxer  Democratic candidate
12. Bruce Herschensohn  Republican candidate
11a. Dianne Feinstein  Democratic candidate
14a. John Seymour  Republican incumbent
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
31. Bob Baker  Democratic candidate
32. Jay C. Kim  Republican candidate

STATE: California  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 42
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
11. Barbara Boxer  Democratic candidate
12. Bruce Herschensohn  Republican candidate
11a. Dianne Feinstein  Democratic candidate
14a. John Seymour  Republican incumbent
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. George E. Brown Jr.  Democratic incumbent
36. Richard B. Rutan  Republican challenger

STATE: California  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 43
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
11. Barbara Boxer  Democratic candidate
12. Bruce Herschensohn  Republican candidate
11a. Dianne Feinstein  Democratic candidate
14a. John Seymour  Republican incumbent
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
31. Mark A. Takano  Democratic candidate
32. Ken Calvert  Republican candidate

STATE: California  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 44
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
11. Barbara Boxer  Democratic candidate
12. Bruce Herschensohn  Republican candidate
11a. Dianne Feinstein  Democratic candidate
14a. John Seymour  Republican incumbent
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
35. Georgia Smith  Democratic challenger
34. Al McCandless  Republican incumbent

STATE: California  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 45
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
11. Barbara Boxer  Democratic candidate
12. Bruce Herschensohn  Republican candidate
11a. Dianne Feinstein  Democratic candidate
14a. John Seymour  Republican incumbent
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
35. Patricia McCabe  Democratic challenger
34. Dana Rohrabacher Republican incumbent

STATE: California CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 46
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
11. Barbara Boxer Democratic candidate
12. Bruce Herschensohn Republican candidate
11a. Dianne Feinstein Democratic candidate
14a. John Seymour Republican incumbent

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
35. Robert John Banuelos Democratic challenger
34. Robert K. Dornan Republican incumbent

STATE: California CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 47
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
11. Barbara Boxer Democratic candidate
12. Bruce Herschensohn Republican candidate
11a. Dianne Feinstein Democratic candidate
14a. John Seymour Republican incumbent

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
35. John F. Anwiller Democratic challenger
34. C. Christopher Cox Republican incumbent

STATE: California CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 48
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
11. Barbara Boxer Democratic candidate
12. Bruce Herschensohn Republican candidate
11a. Dianne Feinstein Democratic candidate
14a. John Seymour Republican incumbent

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
35. Michael Farber Democratic challenger
34. Ron Packard Republican incumbent

STATE: Colorado CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 01
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
11. Ben Nighthorse Campbell Democratic candidate
12. Terry Considine Republican candidate
29. Hank Brown Republican--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. Patricia Schroeder Democratic incumbent
36. Raymond Diaz Aragon Republican challenger

STATE: Colorado CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 02
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
11. Ben Nighthorse Campbell Democratic candidate
12. Terry Considine Republican candidate
29. Hank Brown Republican--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. David E. Skaggs Democratic incumbent
36. Brian Day Republican challenger

STATE: Colorado CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 06
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
11. Ben Nighthorse Campbell Democratic candidate
12. Terry Considine Republican candidate
29. Hank Brown Republican--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
35. Tom Kolbe Democratic challenger
34. Dan Schaefer Republican incumbent
STATE: Connecticut CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 03
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
  13. Christopher J. Dodd Democratic incumbent
  16. Brooks Johnson Republican challenger
  19. Joseph I. Lieberman Democratic--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
  33. Rosa DeLauro Democratic incumbent
  36. Tom Scott Republican challenger

STATE: Florida CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 03
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
  13. Bob Graham Democratic incumbent
  16. Bill Grant Republican challenger
  29. Connie Mack III Republican--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
  31. Corrine Brown Democratic candidate
  32. Don Weidner Republican candidate

STATE: Florida CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 04
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
  13. Bob Graham Democratic incumbent
  16. Bill Grant Republican challenger
  29. Connie Mack III Republican--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
  31. Mattox Hair Democratic candidate
  32. Tillie Fowler Republican candidate
  41. Charles E. Bennett Democrat--retiring

STATE: Florida CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 06
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
  13. Bob Graham Democratic incumbent
  16. Bill Grant Republican challenger
  29. Connie Mack III Republican--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
  34. Cliff Stearns Republican incumbent

STATE: Florida CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 12
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
  13. Bob Graham Democratic incumbent
  16. Bill Grant Republican challenger
  29. Connie Mack III Republican--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
  31. Tom Mims Democratic candidate
  32. Charles T. Canady Republican candidate
  42. Andy Ireland Republican--retiring

STATE: Florida CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 17
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
  13. Bob Graham Democratic incumbent
  16. Bill Grant Republican challenger
  29. Connie Mack III Republican--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
  31. Carrie Meek Democratic candidate
  41. William Lehman Democrat--retiring

STATE: Florida CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 18
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
  13. Bob Graham Democratic incumbent
16. Bill Grant Republican challenger
29. Connie Mack III Republican--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
35. Magda Montiel Davis Democratic challenger
34. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen Republican incumbent

==============================================
STATE: Florida CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 20
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
13. Bob Graham Democratic incumbent
16. Bill Grant Republican challenger
29. Connie Mack III Republican--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
31. Peter Deutsch Democratic candidate
32. Beverly Kennedy Republican candidate
41. Dante B. Fascell Democrat--retiring

==============================================
STATE: Florida CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 21
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
13. Bob Graham Democratic incumbent
16. Bill Grant Republican challenger
29. Connie Mack III Republican--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
32. Lincoln Diaz-Balart Republican candidate
41. Larry Smith Democrat--retiring

==============================================
STATE: Florida CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 22
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
13. Bob Graham Democratic incumbent
16. Bill Grant Republican challenger
29. Connie Mack III Republican--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
35. Gwen Margolis Democratic challenger
34. E. Clay Shaw Jr. Republican incumbent

==============================================
STATE: Georgia CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 01
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
13. Wyche Fowler Democratic incumbent
16. Paul Coverdell Republican challenger
19. Sam Nunn Democratic--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
31. Barbara Christmas Democratic candidate
32. Jack Kingston Republican candidate
41. Lindsay Thomas Democrat--retiring

==============================================
STATE: Georgia CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 02
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
13. Wyche Fowler Democratic incumbent
16. Paul Coverdell Republican challenger
19. Sam Nunn Democratic--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
31. Sanford Bishop Democratic candidate
32. Jim Dudley Republican candidate
41. Charles Hatcher Democrat--retiring

==============================================
STATE: Georgia CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 03
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
13. Wyche Fowler Democratic incumbent
16. Paul Coverdell Republican challenger
19. Sam Nunn Democratic--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. Richard Ray Democratic incumbent
36. Mac Collins Republican challenger

============================================================

STATE: Georgia CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 04

(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
13. Wyche Fowler Democratic incumbent
16. Paul Coverdell Republican challenger
19. Sam Nunn Democratic--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
31. Cathey Steinberg Democratic candidate
32. John Linder Republican candidate
41. Ben Jones Democrat--retiring

============================================================

STATE: Georgia CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 05

(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
13. Wyche Fowler Democratic incumbent
16. Paul Coverdell Republican challenger
19. Sam Nunn Democratic--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. John Lewis Democratic incumbent
36. Paul R. Stabler Republican challenger

============================================================

STATE: Georgia CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 07

(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
13. Wyche Fowler Democratic incumbent
16. Paul Coverdell Republican challenger
19. Sam Nunn Democratic--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. George "Buddy" Darden Democratic incumbent
36. Al Beverly Republican challenger

============================================================

STATE: Iowa CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 04

(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
15. Jean Lloyd-Jones Democratic challenger
14. Charles E. Grassley Republican incumbent
19. Tom Harkin Democratic--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. Neal Smith Democratic incumbent
36. Paul Lunde Republican challenger

============================================================

STATE: Illinois CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 01

(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
11. Carol Moseley Braun Democratic candidate
12. Richard Williamson Republican candidate
19. Paul Simon Democratic--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
31. Bobby L. Rush Democratic candidate
32. Jay Walker Republican candidate
41. Charles A. Hayes Democrat--retiring

============================================================

STATE: Illinois CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 02

(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
11. Carol Moseley Braun Democratic candidate
12. Richard Williamson Republican candidate
19. Paul Simon Democratic--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
31. Mel Reynolds Democratic candidate
32. Ron Blackstone Republican candidate
STATE: Illinois CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 03
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
11. Carol Moseley Braun Democratic candidate
12. Richard Williamson Republican candidate
19. Paul Simon Democratic--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. William O. Lipinski Democratic incumbent
36. Harry C. Lepinske Republican challenger

STATE: Illinois CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 05
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
11. Carol Moseley Braun Democratic candidate
12. Richard Williamson Republican candidate
19. Paul Simon Democratic--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. Dan Rostenkowski Democratic incumbent
36. Elias R. Zenkich Republican challenger

STATE: Illinois CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 06
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
11. Carol Moseley Braun Democratic candidate
12. Richard Williamson Republican candidate
19. Paul Simon Democratic--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
35. Barry W. Watkins Democratic challenger
34. Henry J. Hyde Republican incumbent

STATE: Illinois CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 07
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
11. Carol Moseley Braun Democratic candidate
12. Richard Williamson Republican candidate
19. Paul Simon Democratic--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. Cardiss Collins Democratic incumbent
36. Norman Boccio Republican challenger

STATE: Illinois CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 09
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
11. Carol Moseley Braun Democratic candidate
12. Richard Williamson Republican candidate
19. Paul Simon Democratic--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. Sidney R. Yates Democratic incumbent
36. Herb Sohn Republican challenger

STATE: Illinois CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 10
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
11. Carol Moseley Braun Democratic candidate
12. Richard Williamson Republican candidate
19. Paul Simon Democratic--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
35. Michael Kennedy Democratic challenger
34. John Porter Republican incumbent

STATE: Illinois CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 11
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
11. Carol Moseley Braun Democratic candidate
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12. Richard Williamson  Republican candidate
19. Paul Simon  Democratic--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. George E. Sangmeister  Democratic incumbent
36. Robert T. Herbsheimer  Republican challenger

===============================================

STATE:  Illinois  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT:  12

(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
11. Carol Moseley Braun  Democratic candidate
12. Richard Williamson  Republican candidate
19. Paul Simon  Democratic--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. Jerry F. Costello  Democratic incumbent
36. Mike Starr  Republican challenger

===============================================

STATE:  Illinois  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT:  13

(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
11. Carol Moseley Braun  Democratic candidate
12. Richard Williamson  Republican candidate
19. Paul Simon  Democratic--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
35. Dennis Temple  Democratic challenger
34. Harris W. Fawell  Republican incumbent

===============================================

STATE:  Illinois  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT:  14

(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
11. Carol Moseley Braun  Democratic candidate
12. Richard Williamson  Republican candidate
19. Paul Simon  Democratic--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
35. Jonathan Abram Reich  Democratic challenger
34. Dennis Hastert  Republican incumbent

===============================================

STATE:  Indiana  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT:  02

(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
15. Joseph H. Hogsett  Democratic challenger
14. Daniel R. Coats  Republican incumbent
29. Richard G. Lugar  Republican--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. Philip R. Sharp  Democratic incumbent
36. William G. Frazier  Republican challenger

===============================================

STATE:  Indiana  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT:  04

(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
15. Joseph H. Hogsett  Democratic challenger
14. Daniel R. Coats  Republican incumbent
29. Richard G. Lugar  Republican--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. Jill L. Long  Democratic incumbent
36. Charles W. Pierson  Republican challenger

===============================================

STATE:  Iowa  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT:  03

(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
15. Jean Lloyd-Jones  Democratic challenger
14. Charles E. Grassley  Republican incumbent
19. Tom Harkin  Democratic--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
35. Elaine Baxter  Democratic challenger
34. Jim Ross Lightfoot  Republican incumbent
STATE: Kansas                     CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 01
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
  15. Gloria O'Dell                Democratic challenger
  14. Robert Dole                 Republican incumbent
  29. Nancy Landon Kassebaum     Republican--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
  35. Duane West                  Democratic challenger
  34. Pat Roberts                Republican incumbent

STATE: Kansas                     CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 03
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
  15. Gloria O'Dell                Democratic challenger
  14. Robert Dole                 Republican incumbent
  29. Nancy Landon Kassebaum     Republican--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
  35. Tom Love                     Democratic challenger
  34. Jan Meyers                 Republican incumbent

STATE: Louisiana                  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 06
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
  13. John B. Breaux             Democratic incumbent
  16. Lyle Stockstill            Republican challenger
  19. J. Bennett Johnston       Democratic--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
  31. Richard H. Baker           Republican incumbent
  32. Clyde C. Holloway          Republican incumbent

STATE: Maryland                    CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 02
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
  13. Barbara A. Mikulski        Democratic incumbent
  16. Alan L. Keyes              Republican challenger
  19. Paul S. Sarbanes           Democratic--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
  35. Michael C. Hickey Jr.      Democratic challenger
  34. Helen Delich Bentley       Republican incumbent

STATE: Maryland                    CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 03
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
  13. Barbara A. Mikulski        Democratic incumbent
  16. Alan L. Keyes              Republican challenger
  19. Paul S. Sarbanes           Democratic--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
  33. Benjamin L. Cardin         Democratic challenger
  36. William T.S. Bricker       Republican challenger

STATE: Maryland                    CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 04
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
  13. Barbara A. Mikulski        Democratic incumbent
  16. Alan L. Keyes              Republican challenger
  19. Paul S. Sarbanes           Democratic--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
  31. Albert R. Wynn            Democratic candidate
  32. Michele Dyson              Republican candidate

STATE: Maryland                    CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 05
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
  13. Barbara A. Mikulski        Democratic incumbent
  16. Alan L. Keyes              Republican challenger
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19. Paul S. Sarbanes          Democratic--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
  33. Steny H. Hoyer           Democratic incumbent
  36. Lawrence J. Hogan Jr.    Republican challenger

====================================
STATE: Maryland               CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 06
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
  13. Barbara A. Mikulski       Democratic incumbent
  16. Alan L. Keyes             Republican challenger
  19. Paul S. Sarbanes          Democratic--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
  31. Thomas H. Hattery         Democratic candidate
  32. Roscoe G. Bartlett        Republican candidate
  41. Beverly B. Byron          Democrat--retiring

====================================
STATE: Maryland               CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 07
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
  13. Barbara A. Mikulski       Democratic incumbent
  16. Alan L. Keyes             Republican challenger
  19. Paul S. Sarbanes          Democratic--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
  33. Kweisi Mfume              Democratic incumbent
  36. Kenneth Kondner           Republican challenger

====================================
STATE: Maryland               CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 08
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
  13. Barbara A. Mikulski       Democratic incumbent
  16. Alan L. Keyes             Republican challenger
  19. Paul S. Sarbanes          Democratic--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
  35. Edward J. Heffernan       Democratic challenger
  34. Constance A. Morella      Republican incumbent

====================================
STATE: Massachusetts          CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 01
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:      NO SENATE RACE
  SEN. #1. Edward M. Kennedy    Democrat--term not up 17
  SEN. #2. John F. Kerry        Democrat--term not up 27
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
  33. John Olver                Democratic incumbent
  36. Patrick Larkin           Republican challenger

====================================
STATE: Massachusetts          CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 02
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:      NO SENATE RACE
  SEN. #1. Edward M. Kennedy    Democrat--term not up 17
  SEN. #2. John F. Kerry        Democrat--term not up 27
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
  33. Richard Neal              Democratic incumbent
  36. Anthony W. Ravosa Jr.     Republican challenger

====================================
STATE: Massachusetts          CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 06
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:      NO SENATE RACE
  SEN. #1. Edward M. Kennedy    Democrat--term not up 17
  SEN. #2. John F. Kerry        Democrat--term not up 27
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
  33. Nicholas Mavroules        Democratic incumbent
  36. Peter Torkildsen          Republican challenger

====================================
STATE: Massachusetts          CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 07
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:      NO SENATE RACE
  SEN. #1. Edward M. Kennedy    Democrat--term not up 17
  SEN. #2. John F. Kerry        Democrat--term not up 27

SEN. #1. Edward M. Kennedy  Democrat--term not up  17
SEN. #2. John F. Kerry  Democrat--term not up  27

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. Edward J. Markey  Democratic incumbent
36. Steven Sohn  Republican challenger

STATE:  Massachusetts  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT:  08
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:  NO SENATE RACE
SEN. #1. Edward M. Kennedy  Democrat--term not up  17
SEN. #2. John F. Kerry  Democrat--term not up  27

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. Joseph P. Kennedy, III  Democratic incumbent

STATE:  Massachusetts  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT:  09
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:  NO SENATE RACE
SEN. #1. Edward M. Kennedy  Democrat--term not up  17
SEN. #2. John F. Kerry  Democrat--term not up  27

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. John Joseph Moakley  Democratic incumbent
36. Martin D. Conboy  Republican challenger

STATE:  Michigan  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT:  02
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:  NO SENATE RACE
SEN. #1. Donald W. Riegle  Democrat--term not up  17
SEN. #2. Carl Levin  Democrat--term not up  27

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
31. John H. Miltner  Democratic candidate
32. Peter Hoekstra  Republican candidate
42. Guy Vander Jagt  Repub.--retiring

STATE:  Michigan  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT:  03
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:  NO SENATE RACE
SEN. #1. Donald W. Riegle  Democrat--term not up  17
SEN. #2. Carl Levin  Democrat--term not up  27

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
35. Carol S. Kooistra  Democratic challenger
34. Paul B. Henry  Republican incumbent

STATE:  Michigan  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT:  04
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:  NO SENATE RACE
SEN. #1. Donald W. Riegle  Democrat--term not up  17
SEN. #2. Carl Levin  Democrat--term not up  27

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
35. Lisa A. Donaldson  Democratic challenger
34. Dave Camp  Republican incumbent

STATE:  Michigan  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT:  05
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:  NO SENATE RACE
SEN. #1. Donald W. Riegle  Democrat--term not up  17
SEN. #2. Carl Levin  Democrat--term not up  27

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
31. James A. Barcia  Democratic candidate
32. Keith Muxlow  Republican candidate
41. Bob Traxler  Democrat--retiring

STATE:  Michigan  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT:  09
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:  NO SENATE RACE
SEN. #1. Donald W. Riegle  Democrat--term not up  17
SEN. #2. Carl Levin  Democrat--term not up  27
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. Dale E. Kildee Democratic incumbent
36. Megan O'Neill Republican challenger

===============================================
STATE: Michigan CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 10
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE: NO SENATE RACE
SEN. #1. Donald W. Riegle Democrat--term not up 17
SEN. #2. Carl Levin Democrat--term not up 27
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. David E. Bonior Democratic incumbent
36. Douglas Carl Republican challenger

===============================================
STATE: Michigan CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 11
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE: NO SENATE RACE
SEN. #1. Donald W. Riegle Democrat--term not up 17
SEN. #2. Carl Levin Democrat--term not up 27
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
31. Walter Briggs Democratic candidate
32. Joseph K. Knollenberg Republican candidate
42. William S. Broomfield Repub.--retiring

===============================================
STATE: Michigan CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 15
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE: NO SENATE RACE
SEN. #1. Donald W. Riegle Democrat--term not up 17
SEN. #2. Carl Levin Democrat--term not up 27
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. Barbara-Rose Collins Democratic incumbent
36. Charles C. Vincent Republican challenger

===============================================
STATE: Michigan CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 16
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE: NO SENATE RACE
SEN. #1. Donald W. Riegle Democrat--term not up 17
SEN. #2. Carl Levin Democrat--term not up 27
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. John D. Dingell Democratic incumbent
36. Frank Beaumont Republican challenger

===============================================
STATE: Minnesota CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 01
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE: NO SENATE RACE
SEN. #1. Dave Durenberger Repub.--term not up 18
SEN. #2. Paul David Wellstone Democrat--term not up 17
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. Timothy J. Penny Democratic incumbent
36. Timothy R. Droogsma Republican challenger

===============================================
STATE: Minnesota CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 02
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE: NO SENATE RACE
SEN. #1. Dave Durenberger Repub.--term not up 18
SEN. #2. Paul David Wellstone Democrat--term not up 17
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
31. David Minge Democratic candidate
32. Cal R. Ludeman Republican candidate
42. Vin Weber Repub.--retiring

===============================================
STATE: Minnesota CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 04
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE: NO SENATE RACE
SEN. #1. Dave Durenberger Repub.--term not up 18
SEN. #2. Paul David Wellstone Democrat--term not up 17
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Congressional District</th>
<th>Names for U.S. Senate</th>
<th>Names for U.S. House of Representatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>Sen. #1. Dave Durenberger Repub.--term not up 18</td>
<td>33. Gerry Sikorski Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sen. #2. Paul David Wellstone Democrat--term not up 17</td>
<td>36. Rod Grams Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>15. Geri Rothman-Serot Democratic challenger</td>
<td>33. William L. Clay Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>15. Geri Rothman-Serot Democratic challenger</td>
<td>33. Joan Kelly Horn Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>15. Geri Rothman-Serot Democratic challenger</td>
<td>33. Richard A. Gephardt Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14. Christopher S. (Kit) Bond Republican incumbent</td>
<td>36. Mack Holekamp Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>15. Geri Rothman-Serot Democratic challenger</td>
<td>33. Alan Wheat Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>15. Geri Rothman-Serot Democratic challenger</td>
<td>35. Pat Danner Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14. Christopher S. (Kit) Bond Republican incumbent</td>
<td>34. Tom Coleman Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nebraska

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Congressional District</th>
<th>Names for U.S. Senate</th>
<th>Names for U.S. House of Representatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Sen. #1. Robert Kerrey Democrat--term not up 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STATE: New Hampshire  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 01
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
11. John Rauh Democratic candidate
12. Judd Gregg Republican candidate
29. Bob Smith Repub.--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
35. Bob Preston Democratic challenger
34. Bill Zeliff Republican incumbent

STATE: New Jersey  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 01
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE: NO SENATE RACE
SEN. #1. Frank R. Lautenberg Democrat--term not up 17
SEN. #2. Bill Bradley Democrat--term not up 27
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. Robert E. Andrews Democratic incumbent
36. Lee A. Solomon Republican challenger

STATE: New Jersey  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 02
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE: NO SENATE RACE
SEN. #1. Frank R. Lautenberg Democrat--term not up 17
SEN. #2. Bill Bradley Democrat--term not up 27
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. William J. Hughes Democratic incumbent
36. Frank A. LoBiondo Republican challenger

STATE: New Jersey  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 05
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE: NO SENATE RACE
SEN. #1. Frank R. Lautenberg Democrat--term not up 17
SEN. #2. Bill Bradley Democrat--term not up 27
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
35. Frank R. Lucas Democratic challenger
34. Marge Roukema Republican incumbent

STATE: New Jersey  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 07
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE: NO SENATE RACE
SEN. #1. Frank R. Lautenberg Democrat--term not up 17
SEN. #2. Bill Bradley Democrat--term not up 27
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
31. Leonard R. Sendelsky Democratic candidate
32. Bob Franks Republican candidate

STATE: New Jersey  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 10
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE: NO SENATE RACE
SEN. #1. Frank R. Lautenberg Democrat--term not up 17
SEN. #2. Bill Bradley Democrat--term not up 27
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. Donald M. Payne Democratic incumbent
36. Alfred D. Palermo Republican challenger

STATE: New Jersey  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 11
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE: NO SENATE RACE
SEN. #1. Frank R. Lautenberg Democrat--term not up 17
SEN. #2. Bill Bradley Democrat--term not up 27
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
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35. Ona Spiridellis            Democratic challenger
34. Dean A. Gallo              Republican incumbent

===========================================================================
STATE:  New York               CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT:  02
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
   15. Robert Abrams              Democratic challenger
   14. Alfonse M. D'Amato          Republican incumbent
   19. Daniel Patrick Moynihan     Democrat--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
   33. Thomas J. Downey           Democratic incumbent
   36. Rick A. Lazio              Republican challenger

===========================================================================
STATE:  New York               CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT:  03
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
   15. Robert Abrams              Democratic challenger
   14. Alfonse M. D'Amato          Republican incumbent
   19. Daniel Patrick Moynihan     Democrat--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
   31. Steve A. Orlins            Democratic candidate
   32. Peter T. King               Republican candidate
   41. Robert S. Mrazek            Democrat--retiring

===========================================================================
STATE:  New York               CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT:  04
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
   15. Robert Abrams              Democratic challenger
   14. Alfonse M. D'Amato          Republican incumbent
   19. Daniel Patrick Moynihan     Democrat--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
   31. Philip Schiliro             Democratic candidate
   32. David Levy                  Republican candidate
   42. Norman F. Lent              Repub.--retiring

===========================================================================
STATE:  New York               CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT:  05
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
   15. Robert Abrams              Democratic challenger
   14. Alfonse M. D'Amato          Republican incumbent
   19. Daniel Patrick Moynihan     Democrat--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
   33. Gary L. Ackerman            Democratic incumbent
   36. Allan E. Binder             Republican challenger

===========================================================================
STATE:  New York               CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT:  06
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
   15. Robert Abrams              Democratic challenger
   14. Alfonse M. D'Amato          Republican incumbent
   19. Daniel Patrick Moynihan     Democrat--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
   33. Floyd H. Flake              Democratic incumbent
   36. Dianand D. Bhagwandin       Republican challenger

===========================================================================
STATE:  New York               CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT:  07
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
   15. Robert Abrams              Democratic challenger
   14. Alfonse M. D'Amato          Republican incumbent
   19. Daniel Patrick Moynihan     Democrat--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
   33. Thomas J. Manton            Democratic incumbent
   36. Dennis Shea                 Republican challenger

===========================================================================
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STATE: New York  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 08

(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
   15. Robert Abrams  Democratic challenger
   14. Alfonse M. D'Amato  Republican incumbent
   19. Daniel Patrick Moynihan  Democrat--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
   31. Jerrold Nadler  Democratic candidate
   32. David Askren  Republican candidate

STATE: New York  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 09

(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
   15. Robert Abrams  Democratic challenger
   14. Alfonse M. D'Amato  Republican incumbent
   19. Daniel Patrick Moynihan  Democrat--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
   33. Charles E. Schumer  Democratic incumbent

STATE: New York  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 10

(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
   15. Robert Abrams  Democratic challenger
   14. Alfonse M. D'Amato  Republican incumbent
   19. Daniel Patrick Moynihan  Democrat--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
   33. Edolphus Towns  Democratic incumbent

STATE: New York  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 11

(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
   15. Robert Abrams  Democratic challenger
   14. Alfonse M. D'Amato  Republican incumbent
   19. Daniel Patrick Moynihan  Democrat--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
   33. Major R. Owens  Democratic incumbent

STATE: New York  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 14

(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
   15. Robert Abrams  Democratic challenger
   14. Alfonse M. D'Amato  Republican incumbent
   19. Daniel Patrick Moynihan  Democrat--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
   35. Carolyn Maloney  Democratic challenger
   34. Bill Green  Republican incumbent

STATE: New York  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 16

(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
   15. Robert Abrams  Democratic challenger
   14. Alfonse M. D'Amato  Republican incumbent
   19. Daniel Patrick Moynihan  Democrat--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
   33. Jose E. Serrano  Democratic incumbent
   36. Michael Walters  Republican challenger

STATE: New York  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 17

(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
   15. Robert Abrams  Democratic challenger
   14. Alfonse M. D'Amato  Republican incumbent
   19. Daniel Patrick Moynihan  Democrat--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
   33. Eliot L. Engel  Democratic incumbent
   36. Martin Richman  Republican challenger
STATE: New York CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 19
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
 15. Robert Abrams Democratic challenger
 14. Alfonse M. D'Amato Republican incumbent
 19. Daniel Patrick Moynihan Democrat--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
 35. Neil McCarthy Democratic challenger
 34. Hamilton Fish, Jr. Republican incumbent

STATE: New York CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 20
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
 15. Robert Abrams Democratic challenger
 14. Alfonse M. D'Amato Republican incumbent
 19. Daniel Patrick Moynihan Democrat--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
 35. Jonathan L. Levine Democratic challenger
 34. Benjamin A. Gilman Republican incumbent

STATE: New York CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 27
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
 15. Robert Abrams Democratic challenger
 14. Alfonse M. D'Amato Republican incumbent
 19. Daniel Patrick Moynihan Democrat--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
 35. W. Douglas Call Democratic challenger
 34. Bill Paxon Republican incumbent

STATE: New York CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 29
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
 15. Robert Abrams Democratic challenger
 14. Alfonse M. D'Amato Republican incumbent
 19. Daniel Patrick Moynihan Democrat--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
 33. John J. LaFalce Democratic incumbent
 36. William E. Miller Jr. Republican challenger

STATE: New York CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 30
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
 15. Robert Abrams Democratic challenger
 14. Alfonse M. D'Amato Republican incumbent
 19. Daniel Patrick Moynihan Democrat--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
 31. Dennis Gorski Democratic candidate
 32. Jack Quinn Republican candidate
 41. Henry J. Nowak Democrat--retiring

STATE: New York CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 31
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
 15. Robert Abrams Democratic challenger
 14. Alfonse M. D'Amato Republican incumbent
 19. Daniel Patrick Moynihan Democrat--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
 35. Joseph P. Leahey Democratic challenger
 34. Amo Houghton Republican incumbent

STATE: North Carolina CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 07
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
 13. Terry Sanford Democratic incumbent
16. Lauch Faircloth  Republican challenger
29. Jesse A. Helms  Repub.--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. Charlie Rose  Democratic incumbent
36. Robert C. Anderson  Republican challenger

==================================================================================================

STATE:  North Carolina  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT:  08

(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
13. Terry Sanford  Democratic incumbent
16. Lauch Faircloth  Republican challenger
29. Jesse A. Helms  Repub.--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. W.G. "Bill" Hefner  Democratic incumbent
36. Coy C. Privette  Republican challenger

==================================================================================================

STATE:  Ohio  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT:  03

(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
13. John H. Glenn  Democratic incumbent
16. Mike DeWine  Republican challenger
19. Howard M. Metzenbaum  Democrat--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. Tony P. Hall  Democratic incumbent
36. Peter W. Davis  Republican challenger

==================================================================================================

STATE:  Ohio  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT:  07

(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
13. John H. Glenn  Democratic incumbent
16. Mike DeWine  Republican challenger
19. Howard M. Metzenbaum  Democrat--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
35. Clifford S. Heskett  Democratic challenger
34. David L. Hobson  Republican incumbent

==================================================================================================

STATE:  Ohio  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT:  08

(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
13. John H. Glenn  Democratic incumbent
16. Mike DeWine  Republican challenger
19. Howard M. Metzenbaum  Democrat--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
35. Fred Sennet  Democratic challenger
34. John A. Boehner  Republican incumbent

==================================================================================================

STATE:  Ohio  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT:  18

(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
13. John H. Glenn  Democratic incumbent
16. Mike DeWine  Republican challenger
19. Howard M. Metzenbaum  Democrat--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. Douglas Applegate  Democratic incumbent
36. Bill Ress  Republican challenger

==================================================================================================

STATE:  Oregon  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT:  04

(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
15. Les AuCoin  Democratic challenger
14. Bob Packwood  Republican incumbent
29. Mark O. Hatfield  Repub.--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. Peter A. DeFazio  Democratic incumbent
36. Richard L. Schultz  Republican challenger
STATE: Pennsylvania CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 01
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
15. Lynn Yeakel Democratic challenger
14. Arlen Specter Republican incumbent
19. Harris Wofford Democrat--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. Thomas M. Foglietta Democratic incumbent
36. Craig Snyder Republican challenger

STATE: Pennsylvania CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 02
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
15. Lynn Yeakel Democratic challenger
14. Arlen Specter Republican incumbent
19. Harris Wofford Democrat--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. Lucien E. Blackwell Democratic incumbent
36. Larry Hollin Republican challenger

STATE: Pennsylvania CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 07
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
15. Lynn Yeakel Democratic challenger
14. Arlen Specter Republican incumbent
19. Harris Wofford Democrat--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
35. Frank Daly Democratic challenger
34. Curt Weldon Republican incumbent

STATE: Pennsylvania CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 08
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
15. Lynn Yeakel Democratic challenger
14. Arlen Specter Republican incumbent
19. Harris Wofford Democrat--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. Peter H. Kostmayer Democratic challenger
36. James C. Greenwood Republican challenger

STATE: Pennsylvania CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 13
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
15. Lynn Yeakel Democratic challenger
14. Arlen Specter Republican incumbent
19. Harris Wofford Democrat--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
31. Marjorie M. Mezvinsky Democratic candidate
32. Jon D. Fox Republican candidate
42. Lawrence Coughlin Repub.--retiring

STATE: Pennsylvania CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 14
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
15. Lynn Yeakel Democratic challenger
14. Arlen Specter Republican incumbent
19. Harris Wofford Democrat--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. William J. Coyne Democratic incumbent
36. Byron W. King Republican challenger

STATE: Pennsylvania CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 18
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
15. Lynn Yeakel Democratic challenger
14. Arlen Specter  Republican incumbent
19. Harris Wofford  Democrat--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
35. Frank A. Pecora  Democratic challenger
34. Rick Santorum  Republican incumbent

===========================================================================

STATE: Pennsylvania  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 20

(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
15. Lynn Yeakel  Democratic challenger
14. Arlen Specter  Republican incumbent
19. Harris Wofford  Democrat--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. Austin J. Murphy  Democratic incumbent
36. Bill Townsend  Republican challenger

===========================================================================

STATE: Tennessee  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 02

(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:  NO SENATE RACE
SEN. #1. James R. (Jim) Sass  Democrat--term not up 17
SEN. #2. Albert Gore  Democrat--term not up 27

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
35. Troy Goodale  Democratic challenger
34. John J. "Jimmy" Duncan Jr.  Republican incumbent

===========================================================================

STATE: Tennessee  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 03

(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:  NO SENATE RACE
SEN. #1. James R. (Jim) Sass  Democrat--term not up 17
SEN. #2. Albert Gore  Democrat--term not up 27

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. Marilyn Lloyd  Democratic incumbent
36. Zach Wamp  Republican challenger

===========================================================================

STATE: Tennessee  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 04

(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:  NO SENATE RACE
SEN. #1. James R. (Jim) Sass  Democrat--term not up 17
SEN. #2. Albert Gore  Democrat--term not up 27

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. Jim Cooper  Democratic incumbent
36. Dale Johnson  Republican challenger

===========================================================================

STATE: Texas  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 03

(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:  NO SENATE RACE
SEN. #1. Lloyd Bentsen  Democrat--term not up 17
SEN. #2. Phil Gramm  Repub.--term not up 18

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
34. Sam Johnson  Republican incumbent

===========================================================================

STATE: Texas  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 06

(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:  NO SENATE RACE
SEN. #1. Lloyd Bentsen  Democrat--term not up 17
SEN. #2. Phil Gramm  Repub.--term not up 18

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
35. John E. Dietrich  Democratic challenger
34. Joe L. Barton  Republican incumbent

===========================================================================

STATE: Texas  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 11

(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:  NO SENATE RACE
SEN. #1. Lloyd Bentsen  Democrat--term not up 17
SEN. #2. Phil Gramm  Repub.--term not up 18

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

33. Chet Edwards Democratic incumbent
36. James W. Broyles Republican challenger

STATE: Texas CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 13
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE: NO SENATE RACE
SEN. #1. Lloyd Bentsen Democrat--term not up 17
SEN. #2. Phil Gramm Repub.--term not up 18
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. Bill Sarpalius Democratic incumbent
36. Beau Bolter Republican challenger

STATE: Texas CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 15
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE: NO SENATE RACE
SEN. #1. Lloyd Bentsen Democrat--term not up 17
SEN. #2. Phil Gramm Repub.--term not up 18
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. E. "Kika" de la Garza Democratic incumbent
36. Tom Haughey Republican challenger

STATE: Texas CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 18
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE: NO SENATE RACE
SEN. #1. Lloyd Bentsen Democrat--term not up 17
SEN. #2. Phil Gramm Repub.--term not up 18
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. Craig Washington Democratic incumbent
36. Edward Blum Republican challenger

STATE: Texas CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 25
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE: NO SENATE RACE
SEN. #1. Lloyd Bentsen Democrat--term not up 17
SEN. #2. Phil Gramm Repub.--term not up 18
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. Michael A. Andrews Democratic incumbent
36. Dolly Madison McKenna Republican challenger

STATE: Texas CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 26
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE: NO SENATE RACE
SEN. #1. Lloyd Bentsen Democrat--term not up 17
SEN. #2. Phil Gramm Repub.--term not up 18
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
35. John Wayne Caton Democratic challenger
34. Dick Armey Republican incumbent

STATE: Texas CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 29
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE: NO SENATE RACE
SEN. #1. Lloyd Bentsen Democrat--term not up 17
SEN. #2. Phil Gramm Repub.--term not up 18
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
31. Gene Green Democratic candidate
32. Clark Kent Ervin Republican candidate

STATE: Texas CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 30
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE: NO SENATE RACE
SEN. #1. Lloyd Bentsen Democrat--term not up 17
SEN. #2. Phil Gramm Repub.--term not up 18
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
31. Eddie Bernice Johnson Democratic candidate
32. Lucy Cain Republican candidate
STATE: Virginia  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 03
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:  NO SENATE RACE
  SEN. #1. Charles S. Robb  Democrat--term not up  17
  SEN. #2. John W. Warner  Repub.--term not up  18
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
  31. Robert C. Scott  Democratic candidate
  32. Daniel Jenkins  Republican candidate

---

STATE: Virginia  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 04
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:  NO SENATE RACE
  SEN. #1. Charles S. Robb  Democrat--term not up  17
  SEN. #2. John W. Warner  Repub.--term not up  18
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
  33. Norman Sisisky  Democratic incumbent
  36. A.J. "Tony" Zevgolis  Republican challenger

---

STATE: Virginia  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 07
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:  NO SENATE RACE
  SEN. #1. Charles S. Robb  Democrat--term not up  17
  SEN. #2. John W. Warner  Repub.--term not up  18
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
  34. Thomas J. Bliley  Republican incumbent

---

STATE: Virginia  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 08
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:  NO SENATE RACE
  SEN. #1. Charles S. Robb  Democrat--term not up  17
  SEN. #2. John W. Warner  Repub.--term not up  18
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
  33. James P. Moran Jr.  Democratic incumbent
  36. Kyle McSlarrow  Republican challenger

---

STATE: Virginia  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 09
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:  NO SENATE RACE
  SEN. #1. Charles S. Robb  Democrat--term not up  17
  SEN. #2. John W. Warner  Repub.--term not up  18
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
  33. Rick Boucher  Democratic incumbent
  36. Gary Weddle  Republican challenger

---

STATE: Virginia  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 10
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:  NO SENATE RACE
  SEN. #1. Charles S. Robb  Democrat--term not up  17
  SEN. #2. John W. Warner  Repub.--term not up  18
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
  35. Raymond E. Vickery Jr.  Democratic challenger
  34. Frank R. Wolf  Republican incumbent

---

STATE: Washington  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 01
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
  11. Patty Murray  Democratic candidate
  12. Rod Chandler  Republican candidate
  29. Slade Gorton  Repub.--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
  31. Maria Cantwell  Democratic candidate
  32. Gary Nelson  Republican candidate
  42. John Miller  Repub.--retiring

---

STATE: Washington  CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 02
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
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11. Patty Murray               Democratic candidate
12. Rod Chandler               Republican candidate
29. Slade Gorton               Repub.--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. Al Swift                   Democratic incumbent
36. Jack Metcalf               Republican challenger

STATE:  Washington             CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT:  07
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
11. Patty Murray               Democratic candidate
12. Rod Chandler               Republican candidate
29. Slade Gorton               Repub.--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. Jim McDermott              Democratic incumbent
36. Glenn C. Hampson            Republican challenger

STATE:  Washington             CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT:  08
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
11. Patty Murray               Democratic candidate
12. Rod Chandler               Republican candidate
29. Slade Gorton               Repub.--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
31. George O. Tamblyn           Democratic candidate
32. Jennifer Dunn               Republican candidate
42. Rod Chandler                Repub.--retiring

STATE:  West Virginia          CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT:  01
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:      NO SENATE RACE
SEN. #1. Robert C. Byrd         Democrat--term not up  17
SEN. #2. John (Jay) Rockefeller IV  "   --term not up  27

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. Alan B. Mollohan            Democratic incumbent

STATE:  Wisconsin              CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT:  04
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
15. Russell Feingold            Democratic challenger
14. Robert W. Kasten            Republican incumbent
19. Herb Kohl                   Democrat--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. Gerald Kleczka              Democratic incumbent
36. Joseph L. Cook              Republican challenger

STATE:  Wisconsin              CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT:  05
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
15. Russell Feingold            Democratic challenger
14. Robert W. Kasten            Republican incumbent
19. Herb Kohl                   Democrat--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
31. Thomas Barrett              Democratic candidate
32. Donalda Ann Hammersmith     Republican candidate
41. Jim Moody                   Democrat--retiring

STATE:  Wisconsin              CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT:  09
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
15. Russell Feingold            Democratic challenger
14. Robert W. Kasten            Republican incumbent
19. Herb Kohl                   Democrat--term not up

(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
35. Ingrid K. Buxton            Democratic challenger
34. F. James Sensenbrenner Jr. Republican incumbent

STATE: Wyoming CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 98
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE: NO SENATE RACE
SEN. #1. Malcolm Wallop Repub.--term not up 18
SEN. #2. Alan K. Simpson Repub.--term not up 28
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
35. Jon Herschler Democratic challenger
34. Craig Thomas Republican incumbent

1992 SAMPLE BALLOT CARD

BALLOT CARD
For the November 1992 General Election

State: New York
Congressional District: 14
Democratic Republican
Party Party

CANDIDATES FOR THE
U.S. HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES: Carolyn Maloney Bill Green

CANDIDATES FOR THE
U.S. SENATE: Robert Abrams Alfonse M. D'Amato

BALLOT CARD 1994

The 1994 study included an experiment in the layout of the Ballot Card. Respondents were presented alternative versions of the ballot identical in content, but different in design. For sample ballots please contact the NES study staff.

CANDIDATE LIST 1994

Alabama 03
33 Glen Browder Democratic incumbent
36 Ben Hand Republican challenger
17 Howell T. Heflin Democratic -- term not up
27 Richard C. Shelly Democratic -- term not up
53 James E. Folsom, Jr Democratic incumbent
56 Fob James, Jr. Republican challenger

Alabama 04
33 Tom Bevill Democratic incumbent
17 Howell T. Heflin Democratic -- term not up
27 Richard C. Shelly Democratic -- term not up
53 James E. Folsom, Jr Democratic incumbent
56 Fob James, Jr. Republican challenger

Alabama 05
33 Robert E. "Bud" Cram Democratic incumbent
36 Wayne Parker Republican challenger
17 Howell T. Heflin Democratic -- term not up
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27 Richard C. Shelly Democratic -- term not up
53 James E. Folsom, Jr Democratic incumbent
56 Fob James, Jr. Republican challenger

Alabama 06
35 Larry Fortenberry Democratic challenger
34 Spencer Bachus Republican incumbent
17 Howell T. Heflin Democratic -- term not up
27 Richard C. Shelly Democratic -- term not up
53 James E. Folsom, Jr Democratic incumbent
56 Fob James, Jr. Republican challenger

Alabama 07
33 Earl F. Hilliard Democratic incumbent
36 Alfred J. Middleton, Republican challenger
17 Howell T. Heflin Democratic -- term not up
27 Richard C. Shelly Democratic -- term not up
53 James E. Folsom, Jr Democratic incumbent
56 Fob James, Jr. Republican challenger

Arkansas 04
35 Jay Bradford Democratic challenger
34 Jay Dickey Republican incumbent
17 David Pryor Democratic -- term not up
27 Dale Bumpers Democratic -- term not up
53 Jim Guy Tucker Democratic incumbent
56 Sheffield Nelson Republican challenger

Arkansas 01
31 Chuck Blanchard Democratic candidate
32 Matt Salmon Republican candidate
11 Sam Coppersmith Democratic candidate
12 Jon Kyl Republican candidate
29 John McCain Republican -- term not up
55 Eddie Basha Democratic challenger
54 Fife Symington Republican incumbent

Arizona 02
33 Ed Pastor Democratic incumbent
36 Robert MacDonald Republican challenger
11 Sam Coppersmith Democratic candidate
12 Jon Kyl Republican candidate
29 John McCain Republican -- term not up
55 Eddie Basha Democratic challenger
54 Fife Symington Republican incumbent

Arizona 03
35 Howard Lee Sprague Democratic challenger
34 Bob Stump Republican incumbent
11 Sam Coppersmith Democratic candidate
12 Jon Kyl Republican candidate
29 John McCain Republican -- term not up
55 Eddie Basha Democratic challenger
54 Fife Symington Republican incumbent

Arizona 04
31 Carol Cure Democratic candidate
32 John Shadegg Republican candidate
11 Sam Coppersmith Democratic candidate
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>Jon Kyl</td>
<td>Republican candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John McCain</td>
<td>Republican -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eddie Basha</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fife Symington</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>Karan English</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J.D. Hayworth</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sam Coppersmith</td>
<td>Democratic candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jon Kyl</td>
<td>Republican candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John McCain</td>
<td>Republican -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eddie Basha</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fife Symington</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>Katie Hirning</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Doolittle</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dianne Feinstein</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Huffington</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barbara Boxer</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kathleen Brown</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pete Wilson</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>Lynn Woolsey</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michael J. Nugent</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dianne Feinstein</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Huffington</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barbara Boxer</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kathleen Brown</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pete Wilson</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>Nancy Pelosi</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elsa C. Cheung</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dianne Feinstein</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Huffington</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barbara Boxer</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kathleen Brown</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pete Wilson</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>Ronald V. Dellums</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deborah Wright</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dianne Feinstein</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Huffington</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barbara Boxer</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kathleen Brown</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pete Wilson</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ellen Schwartz</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Baker</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dianne Feinstein</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Huffington</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barbara Boxer</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kathleen Brown</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pete Wilson</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
California 12
33 Tom Lantos Democratic incumbent
36 Deborah Wilder Republican challenger
13 Dianne Feinstein Democratic incumbent
16 Michael Huffington Republican challenger
19 Barbara Boxer Democratic -- term not up
55 Kathleen Brown Democratic challenger
54 Pete Wilson Republican incumbent

California 13
33 Pete Stark Democratic incumbent
36 Larry Molton Republican challenger
13 Dianne Feinstein Democratic incumbent
16 Michael Huffington Republican challenger
19 Barbara Boxer Democratic -- term not up
55 Kathleen Brown Democratic challenger
54 Pete Wilson Republican incumbent

California 19
33 Richard H. Lehman Democratic incumbent
36 George P. Radanovich Republican challenger
13 Dianne Feinstein Democratic incumbent
16 Michael Huffington Republican challenger
19 Barbara Boxer Democratic -- term not up
55 Kathleen Brown Democratic challenger
54 Pete Wilson Republican incumbent

California 20
33 Cal Dooley Democratic incumbent
36 Paul Young Republican challenger
13 Dianne Feinstein Democratic incumbent
16 Michael Huffington Republican challenger
19 Barbara Boxer Democratic -- term not up
55 Kathleen Brown Democratic challenger
54 Pete Wilson Republican incumbent

California 24
33 Anthony C. Beilenson Democratic incumbent
36 Rich Sybert Republican challenger
13 Dianne Feinstein Democratic incumbent
16 Michael Huffington Republican challenger
19 Barbara Boxer Democratic -- term not up
55 Kathleen Brown Democratic challenger
54 Pete Wilson Republican incumbent

California 26
33 Howard L. Berman Democratic incumbent
36 Gary E. Forsch Republican challenger
13 Dianne Feinstein Democratic incumbent
16 Michael Huffington Republican challenger
19 Barbara Boxer Democratic -- term not up
55 Kathleen Brown Democratic challenger
54 Pete Wilson Republican incumbent

California 27
35 Doug Kahn Democratic challenger
34 Carlos J. Moorhead Republican incumbent
13 Dianne Feinstein Democratic incumbent
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Michael Huffington</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Barbara Boxer</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Kathleen Brown</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Pete Wilson</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Tommy Randle</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>David Dreier</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Dianne Feinstein</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Michael Huffington</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Barbara Boxer</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Kathleen Brown</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Pete Wilson</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Henry A. Waxman</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Paul Stepanek</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Dianne Feinstein</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Michael Huffington</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Barbara Boxer</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Kathleen Brown</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Pete Wilson</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Xavier Becerra</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>David A. Ramirez</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Dianne Feinstein</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Michael Huffington</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Barbara Boxer</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Kathleen Brown</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Pete Wilson</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Julian C. Dixon</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Ernie A. Farhat</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Dianne Feinstein</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Michael Huffington</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Barbara Boxer</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Kathleen Brown</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Pete Wilson</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Lucille Roybal-Allar</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Dianne Feinstein</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Michael Huffington</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Barbara Boxer</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Kathleen Brown</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Pete Wilson</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Maxine Waters</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Nate Truman</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Dianne Feinstein</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Michael Huffington</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Barbara Boxer</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Kathleen Brown</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Pete Wilson</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Peter Mathews</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Steve B. Horn</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Dianne Feinstein</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Michael Huffington</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Barbara Boxer</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Kathleen Brown</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Pete Wilson</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California 39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>R.O. &quot;Bob&quot; Davis</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Ed Royce</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Dianne Feinstein</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Michael Huffington</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Barbara Boxer</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Kathleen Brown</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Pete Wilson</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California 40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Donald &quot;Don&quot; Rusk</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Jerry Lewis</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Dianne Feinstein</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Michael Huffington</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Barbara Boxer</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Kathleen Brown</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Pete Wilson</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California 42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>George E. Brown, Jr.</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Rob Guzman</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Dianne Feinstein</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Michael Huffington</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Barbara Boxer</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Kathleen Brown</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Pete Wilson</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California 43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Mark A. Takano</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Ken Calvert</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Dianne Feinstein</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Michael Huffington</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Barbara Boxer</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Kathleen Brown</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Pete Wilson</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California 44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Steve Clute</td>
<td>Democratic candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Sonny Bono</td>
<td>Republican candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Dianne Feinstein</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Michael Huffington</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Barbara Boxer</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Kathleen Brown</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Pete Wilson</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Brett Williamson</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Dana Rohrabacher</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Dianne Feinstein</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Michael Huffington</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Barbara Boxer</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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California  46
35  Michael Farber  Democratic challenger
34  Robert K. Dornan  Republican incumbent
13  Dianne Feinstein  Democratic incumbent
16  Michael Huffington  Republican challenger
19  Barbara Boxer  Democratic -- term not up
55  Kathleen Brown  Democratic challenger
54  Pete Wilson  Republican incumbent

California  47
35  Gary Kingsbury  Democratic challenger
34  Christopher Cox  Republican incumbent
13  Dianne Feinstein  Democratic incumbent
16  Michael Huffington  Republican challenger
19  Barbara Boxer  Democratic -- term not up
55  Kathleen Brown  Democratic challenger
54  Pete Wilson  Republican incumbent

California  48
35  Andrei Leschick  Democratic challenger
34  Ron Packard  Republican incumbent
13  Dianne Feinstein  Democratic incumbent
16  Michael Huffington  Republican challenger
19  Barbara Boxer  Democratic -- term not up
55  Kathleen Brown  Democratic challenger
54  Pete Wilson  Republican incumbent

California  49
33  Lynn Schenk  Democratic incumbent
36  Brian F. Bilbray  Republican challenger
13  Dianne Feinstein  Democratic incumbent
16  Michael Huffington  Republican challenger
19  Barbara Boxer  Democratic -- term not up
55  Kathleen Brown  Democratic challenger
54  Pete Wilson  Republican incumbent

California  50
33  Bob Filner  Democratic incumbent
36  Mary Alice Acevedo  Republican challenger
13  Dianne Feinstein  Democratic incumbent
16  Michael Huffington  Republican challenger
19  Barbara Boxer  Democratic -- term not up
55  Kathleen Brown  Democratic challenger
54  Pete Wilson  Republican incumbent

Colorado  01
33  Patricia Schroeder  Democratic incumbent
36  William Eggert  Republican challenger
18  Hank Brown  Republican -- term not up
17  Ben Nighthorse Campbell  Democratic -- term not up
53  Roy Romer  Democratic incumbent
56  Bruce Benson  Republican challenger

Colorado  02
33  David E. Skaggs  Democratic incumbent
36  Patricia Miller  Republican challenger

Page 200
Hank Brown  Republican -- term not up
Ben Nighthorse Campbell  Democratic -- term not up
Roy Romer  Democratic incumbent
Bruce Benson  Republican challenger

Colorado  04
Cathy Kipp  Democratic challenger
Wayne Allard  Republican incumbent
Hank Brown  Republican -- term not up
Ben Nighthorse Campbell  Democratic -- term not up
Roy Romer  Democratic incumbent
Bruce Benson  Republican challenger

Colorado  06
John Hallen  Democratic challenger
Dan Schaefer  Republican incumbent
Hank Brown  Republican -- term not up
Ben Nighthorse Campbell  Democratic -- term not up
Roy Romer  Democratic incumbent
Bruce Benson  Republican challenger

Connecticut  03
Rosa L. DeLauro  Democratic incumbent
Susan E. Johnson  Republican challenger
Joe Lieberman  Democratic incumbent
Jerry Labriola  Republican challenger
Christopher Dodd  Democratic -- term not up
Bill Curry  Democratic candidate
John G. Rowland  Republican candidate

Florida  02
Pete Peterson  Democratic incumbent
Carole Griffin  Republican challenger
Hugh E. Rodham  Democratic challenger
Connie Mack  Republican incumbent
Bob Graham  Democratic -- term not up
Lawton Chiles  Democratic incumbent
Jeb Bush  Republican challenger

Florida  03
Corrine Brown  Democratic incumbent
Marc Little  Republican challenger
Hugh E. Rodham  Democratic challenger
Connie Mack  Republican incumbent
Bob Graham  Democratic -- term not up
Lawton Chiles  Democratic incumbent
Jeb Bush  Republican challenger

Florida  04
Tillie Fowler  Republican incumbent
Hugh E. Rodham  Democratic challenger
Connie Mack  Republican incumbent
Bob Graham  Democratic -- term not up
Lawton Chiles  Democratic incumbent
Jeb Bush  Republican challenger

Florida  06
Clifford B. Stearns  Republican incumbent
Hugh E. Rodham  Democratic challenger
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Connie Mack</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Bob Graham</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Lawton Chiles</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Jeb Bush</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Florida 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Robert Connors</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Charles T. Canady</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Hugh E. Rodham</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Connie Mack</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Bob Graham</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Florida 13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Dan Miller</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Hugh E. Rodham</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Connie Mack</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Bob Graham</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Lawton Chiles</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Jeb Bush</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Florida 15**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Sue Munsey</td>
<td>Democratic candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Dave Weldon</td>
<td>Republican candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Hugh E. Rodham</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Connie Mack</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Bob Graham</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Lawton Chiles</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Jeb Bush</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Florida 16**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>John P. Comerford</td>
<td>Democratic candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Mark Foley</td>
<td>Republican candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Hugh E. Rodham</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Connie Mack</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Bob Graham</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Lawton Chiles</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Jeb Bush</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Florida 17**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Carrie P. Meek</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Hugh E. Rodham</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Connie Mack</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Bob Graham</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Lawton Chiles</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Jeb Bush</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Florida 18**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Ileana Ros-Lehtinen</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Hugh E. Rodham</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Connie Mack</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Bob Graham</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Lawton Chiles</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Jeb Bush</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Florida 21**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Lincoln Diaz-Balart</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Hugh E. Rodham</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connie Mack</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bob Graham</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lawton Chiles</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeb Bush</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. Clay Shaw, Jr.</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hugh E. Rodham</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connie Mack</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bob Graham</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lawton Chiles</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeb Bush</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raymond Beckworth</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jack Kingston</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sam Nunn</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Coverdell</td>
<td>Republican -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zell Miller</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guy Millner</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sanford D. Bishop, J</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Clayton</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sam Nunn</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Coverdell</td>
<td>Republican -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zell Miller</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guy Millner</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fred R. Overby</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mac Collins</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sam Nunn</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Coverdell</td>
<td>Republican -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zell Miller</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guy Millner</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comer Yates</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Linder</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sam Nunn</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Coverdell</td>
<td>Republican -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zell Miller</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guy Millner</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Lewis</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dale Dixon</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sam Nunn</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Coverdell</td>
<td>Republican -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zell Miller</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guy Millner</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ben Jones</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newt Gingrich</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sam Nunn</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Coverdell</td>
<td>Republican -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancestral codebook: 1992 to 1997 Appendix Codebook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 Zell Miller                                      Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 Guy Millner                                     Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Georgia** 07

| 33 George Buddy Darden                             Democratic incumbent |
| 36 Bob Barr                                        Republican challenger |
| 17 Sam Nunn                                        Democratic -- term not up |
| 18 Paul Coverdell                                  Republican -- term not up |
| 53 Zell Miller                                     Democratic incumbent |
| 56 Guy Millner                                     Republican challenger |

| 33 George Buddy Darden                             Democratic incumbent |
| 36 Bob Barr                                        Republican challenger |
| 17 Sam Nunn                                        Democratic -- term not up |
| 18 Paul Coverdell                                  Republican -- term not up |
| 53 Zell Miller                                     Democratic incumbent |
| 56 Guy Millner                                     Republican challenger |

**Georgia** 08

| 31 Craig Mathis                                    Democratic candidate |
| 32 Saxby Chambliss                                 Republican candidate |
| 17 Sam Nunn                                        Democratic -- term not up |
| 18 Paul Coverdell                                  Republican -- term not up |
| 53 Zell Miller                                     Democratic incumbent |
| 56 Guy Millner                                     Republican challenger |

**Iowa** 03

| 35 Elaine Baxter                                   Democratic challenger |
| 34 Jim Ross Lightfoot                              Republican incumbent |
| 17 Tom Harkin                                      Democratic -- term not up |
| 18 Charles Grassley                                Republican -- term not up |
| 55 Bonnie J. Campbell                              Democratic challenger |
| 54 Terry E. Branstad                               Republican incumbent |

**Iowa** 04

| 33 Neal Smith                                      Democratic incumbent |
| 36 Greg Ganske                                     Republican challenger |
| 17 Tom Harkin                                      Democratic -- term not up |
| 18 Charles Grassley                                Republican -- term not up |
| 55 Bonnie J. Campbell                              Democratic challenger |
| 54 Terry E. Branstad                               Republican incumbent |

**Illinois** 01

| 33 Bobby L. Rush                                   Democratic incumbent |
| 36 William J. Kelly                                Republican challenger |
| 17 Paul Simon                                      Democratic -- term not up |
| 27 Carol Mosely-Braun                              Democratic -- term not up |
| 55 Dawn Clark Netsch                               Democratic challenger |
| 54 Jim Edgar                                       Republican incumbent |

**Illinois** 02

| 33 Mel Reynolds                                    Democratic incumbent |
| 17 Paul Simon                                      Democratic -- term not up |
| 27 Carol Mosely-Braun                              Democratic -- term not up |
| 55 Dawn Clark Netsch                               Democratic challenger |
| 54 Jim Edgar                                       Republican incumbent |

**Illinois** 03

| 33 William O. Lipinski                             Democratic incumbent |
| 36 Jim Nalepa                                      Republican challenger |
| 17 Paul Simon                                      Democratic -- term not up |
| 27 Carol Mosely-Braun                              Democratic -- term not up |
| 55 Dawn Clark Netsch                               Democratic challenger |
| 54 Jim Edgar                                       Republican incumbent |

**Illinois** 04
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Luis V. Gutierrez</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Steven Valtierra</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Paul Simon</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Carol Mosely-Braun</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Dawn Clark Netsch</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Jim Edgar</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Illinois 05**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Dan Rostenkowski</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Michael Patrick Flan</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Paul Simon</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Carol Mosely-Braun</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Dawn Clark Netsch</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Jim Edgar</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Illinois 06**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Tom Berry</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Henry J. Hyde</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Paul Simon</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Carol Mosely-Braun</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Dawn Clark Netsch</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Jim Edgar</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Illinois 08**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Robert C. Walberg</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Philip M. Crane</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Paul Simon</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Carol Mosely-Braun</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Dawn Clark Netsch</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Jim Edgar</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Illinois 09**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Sidney R. Yates</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>George Edward Larney</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Paul Simon</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Carol Mosely-Braun</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Dawn Clark Netsch</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Jim Edgar</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Illinois 10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Andrew Krupp</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>John Edward Porter</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Paul Simon</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Carol Mosely-Braun</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Dawn Clark Netsch</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Jim Edgar</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Illinois 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Jerry F. Costello</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Jan Morris</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Paul Simon</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Carol Mosely-Braun</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Dawn Clark Netsch</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Jim Edgar</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Illinois 13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>William A. Riley</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Harris W. Fawell</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Term Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Paul Simon</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>-- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carol Mosely-Braun</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>-- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dawn Clark Netsch</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Edgar</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Glenn Poshard</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brent Winters</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Simon</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>-- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carol Mosely-Braun</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>-- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dawn Clark Netsch</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Edgar</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>Joseph H. Hogsett</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>David M. McIntosh</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Jontz</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard G. Lugar</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Coats</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>-- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evan Bayh</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>-- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>Jill L. Long</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Edward Souder</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Jontz</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard G. Lugar</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Coats</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>-- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evan Bayh</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>-- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>Natalie M. Bruner</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dan Burton</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Jontz</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard G. Lugar</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Coats</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>-- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evan Bayh</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>-- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>Lee H. Hamilton</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jean Leising</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Jontz</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard G. Lugar</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Coats</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>-- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evan Bayh</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>-- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>John Carlin</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sam Brownback</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nancy Landon Kassebaum</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>-- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Dole</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>-- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Slattery</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Graves</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>Judy Hancock</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan Meyers</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nancy Landon Kassebaum</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>-- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Dole</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>-- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Slattery</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Incumbent/Challenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>Bill Graves Republican candidate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dan Glickman Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Todd Tiahrt Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04</td>
<td>Nancy Landon Kassebaum Republican -- term not up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04</td>
<td>Robert Dole Republican -- term not up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04</td>
<td>Jim Slattery Democratic candidate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04</td>
<td>Bill Graves Republican candidate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>Scotty Baesler Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Matthew Eric Wills Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06</td>
<td>Mitch McConnell Republican -- term not up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06</td>
<td>Wendell H. Ford Democratic -- term not up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06</td>
<td>Brereton C. Jones Democratic -- term not up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>Darryl Baker Democratic challenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04</td>
<td>Richard H. Baker Republican incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04</td>
<td>J. Bennett Johnston Democratic -- term not up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04</td>
<td>John B. Breaux Democratic -- term not up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04</td>
<td>Edwin W. Edwards Democratic -- term not up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>John W. Olver Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Edward Kennedy Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01</td>
<td>W. Mitt Romney Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01</td>
<td>John Kerry Democratic -- term not up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Mark Roosevelt Democratic challenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01</td>
<td>William F. Weld Republican incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>Richard E. Neal Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02</td>
<td>John W. Briare Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02</td>
<td>Edward Kennedy Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02</td>
<td>W. Mitt Romney Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02</td>
<td>John Kerry Democratic -- term not up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02</td>
<td>Mark Roosevelt Democratic challenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02</td>
<td>William F. Weld Republican incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>John F. Tierney Democratic challenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06</td>
<td>Peter G. Torkildsen Republican incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06</td>
<td>Edward Kennedy Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06</td>
<td>W. Mitt Romney Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06</td>
<td>John Kerry Democratic -- term not up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06</td>
<td>Mark Roosevelt Democratic challenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06</td>
<td>William F. Weld Republican incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>John F. Tierney Democratic challenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>Peter G. Torkildsen Republican incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08</td>
<td>Edward Kennedy Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08</td>
<td>W. Mitt Romney Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08</td>
<td>John Kerry Democratic -- term not up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08</td>
<td>Mark Roosevelt Democratic challenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08</td>
<td>William F. Weld Republican incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Joseph P. Kennedy II</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Edward Kennedy</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>W. Mitt Romney</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>John Kerry</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Mark Roosevelt</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>William F. Weld</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Gerry E. Studds</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Keith Jason Hemeon</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Edward Kennedy</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>W. Mitt Romney</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>John Kerry</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Mark Roosevelt</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>William F. Weld</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Massachusetts 10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Gerry E. Studds</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Keith Jason Hemeon</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Edward Kennedy</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>W. Mitt Romney</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>John Kerry</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Mark Roosevelt</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>William F. Weld</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Maryland 02**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Gerry L. Brewster</td>
<td>Democratic candidate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Robert L. Ehrlich, J</td>
<td>Republican candidate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Paul Sarbanes</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>William Brock</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Barbara A. Mikulski</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Parris N. Glendenin</td>
<td>Democratic candidate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Ellen R. Sauerbrey</td>
<td>Republican candidate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Maryland 03**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Benjamin L. Cardin</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Robert Ryan Tousey</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Paul Sarbanes</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>William Brock</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Barbara A. Mikulski</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Parris N. Glendenin</td>
<td>Democratic candidate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Ellen R. Sauerbrey</td>
<td>Republican candidate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Maryland 04**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Albert R. Wynn</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Michele Dyson</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Paul Sarbanes</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>William Brock</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Barbara A. Mikulski</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Parris N. Glendenin</td>
<td>Democratic candidate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Ellen R. Sauerbrey</td>
<td>Republican candidate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Maryland 05**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Steny H. Hoyer</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Donald Devine</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Paul Sarbanes</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>William Brock</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Barbara A. Mikulski</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Parris N. Glendenin</td>
<td>Democratic candidate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Ellen R. Sauerbrey</td>
<td>Republican candidate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Maryland 06**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Paul Muldowney</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Roscoe G. Bartlett</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Paul Sarbanes</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>William Brock</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Barbara A. Mikulski</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Parris N. Glendenin</td>
<td>Democratic candidate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maryland

08
35 Steven Van Grack Democratic challenger
34 Constance A. Morella Republican incumbent
13 Paul Sarbanes Democratic incumbent
16 William Brock Republican challenger
19 Barbara A. Mikulski Democratic -- term not up
51 Parris N. Glendenin Democratic candidate
52 Ellen R. Sauerbrey Republican candidate

Michigan

02
35 Marcus Pete Hoover Democratic challenger
34 Peter Hoekstra Republican incumbent
11 Bob Carr Democratic candidate
12 Spencer Abraham Republican candidate
19 Carl Levin Democratic -- term not up
55 Howard Wolpe Democratic challenger
54 John Engler Republican incumbent

03
35 Betsy J. Flory Democratic challenger
34 Vernon J. Ehlers Republican incumbent
11 Bob Carr Democratic candidate
12 Spencer Abraham Republican candidate
19 Carl Levin Democratic -- term not up
55 Howard Wolpe Democratic challenger
54 John Engler Republican incumbent

04
35 Damion Frasier Democratic challenger
34 Dave Camp Republican incumbent
11 Bob Carr Democratic candidate
12 Spencer Abraham Republican candidate
19 Carl Levin Democratic -- term not up
55 Howard Wolpe Democratic challenger
54 John Engler Republican incumbent

05
33 James A. Barcia Democratic incumbent
36 William T. Anderson Republican challenger
11 Bob Carr Democratic candidate
12 Spencer Abraham Republican candidate
19 Carl Levin Democratic -- term not up
55 Howard Wolpe Democratic challenger
54 John Engler Republican incumbent

09
33 Dale E. Kildee Democratic incumbent
36 Megan O'Neil Republican challenger
11 Bob Carr Democratic candidate
12 Spencer Abraham Republican candidate
19 Carl Levin Democratic -- term not up
55 Howard Wolpe Democratic challenger
54 John Engler Republican incumbent

10
33 David E. Bonior Democratic incumbent
36 David J. Lobsinger Republican challenger
11    Bob Carr               Democratic candidate
12    Spencer Abraham        Republican candidate
19    Carl Levin             Democratic -- term not up
55    Howard Wolpe           Democratic challenger
54    John Engler            Republican incumbent

Michigan    11
35    Mike Bresghold         Democratic challenger
34    Joe Knollenberg        Republican incumbent
11    Bob Carr               Democratic candidate
12    Spencer Abraham        Republican candidate
19    Carl Levin             Democratic -- term not up
55    Howard Wolpe           Democratic challenger
54    John Engler            Republican incumbent

Michigan    12
33    Sander M. Levin        Democratic incumbent
36    John Pappageorge       Republican challenger
11    Bob Carr               Democratic candidate
12    Spencer Abraham        Republican candidate
19    Carl Levin             Democratic -- term not up
55    Howard Wolpe           Democratic challenger
54    John Engler            Republican incumbent

Michigan    13
31    Lynn Rivers            Democratic candidate
32    John A. Schall         Republican candidate
11    Bob Carr               Democratic candidate
12    Spencer Abraham        Republican candidate
19    Carl Levin             Democratic -- term not up
55    Howard Wolpe           Democratic challenger
54    John Engler            Republican incumbent

Michigan    15
33    Barbara-Rose Collins   Democratic incumbent
36    John W. Savage II      Republican challenger
11    Bob Carr               Democratic candidate
12    Spencer Abraham        Republican candidate
19    Carl Levin             Democratic -- term not up
55    Howard Wolpe           Democratic challenger
54    John Engler            Republican incumbent

Michigan    16
33    John D. Dingell        Democratic incumbent
36    Ken Larkin             Republican challenger
11    Bob Carr               Democratic candidate
12    Spencer Abraham        Republican candidate
19    Carl Levin             Democratic -- term not up
55    Howard Wolpe           Democratic challenger
54    John Engler            Republican incumbent

Minnesota    01
31    John C. Hottinger      Democratic candidate
32    Gil Gutknecht          Republican candidate
11    Ann Wynia              Democratic candidate
12    Rod Grams              Republican candidate
19    Paul Wellstone         Democratic -- term not up
55    John Marty             Democratic challenger
54    Arne H. Carlson        Republican incumbent
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Political Party</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>David Minge</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>Gary B. Revier</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>Ann Wynia</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>Rod Grams</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>Paul Wellstone</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>-- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>John Marty</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>Arne H. Carlson</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>Bruce F. Vento</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>Martin Olav Sabo</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>Ann Wynia</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>Rod Grams</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>Paul Wellstone</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>-- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>John Marty</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>Arne H. Carlson</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>William P. &quot;Bill&quot; Lu</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tad Jude</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ann Wynia</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Rod Grams</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Paul Wellstone</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>-- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>John Marty</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Arne H. Carlson</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>James L. Oberstar</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Phil Herwig</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ann Wynia</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Rod Grams</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Paul Wellstone</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>-- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>John Marty</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Arne H. Carlson</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>James M. Talent</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Alan Wheat</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>John Ashcroft</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Christopher Bond</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>-- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Christopher Bond</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>-- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Mel Carnahan</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>-- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Richard A. Gephardt</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Gary Gill</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Alan Wheat</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>John Ashcroft</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Christopher Bond</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>-- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Mel Carnahan</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>-- term not up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Missouri 04
33  Ike Skelton       Democratic incumbent
36  James A. Noland, Jr.  Republican challenger
11  Alan Wheat       Democratic candidate
12  John Ashcroft   Republican candidate
29  Christopher Bond Republican -- term not up
57  Mel Carnahan   Democratic -- term not up

Missouri 05
31  Karen McCarthy  Democratic candidate
32  Ron Freeman    Republican candidate
11  Alan Wheat     Democratic candidate
12  John Ashcroft  Republican candidate
29  Christopher Bond Republican -- term not up
57  Mel Carnahan   Democratic -- term not up

Missouri 06
33  Pat Danner      Democratic incumbent
36  Tina Tucker    Republican challenger
11  Alan Wheat     Democratic candidate
12  John Ashcroft  Republican candidate
29  Christopher Bond Republican -- term not up
57  Mel Carnahan   Democratic -- term not up

Missouri 09
33  Harold L. Volkmer Democratic incumbent
36  Rick Hardy    Republican challenger
11  Alan Wheat     Democratic candidate
12  John Ashcroft  Republican candidate
29  Christopher Bond Republican -- term not up
57  Mel Carnahan   Democratic -- term not up

North Carolina 01
33  Eva Clayton    Democratic incumbent
36  Ted Tyler      Republican challenger
18  Jesse Helms   Republican -- term not up
28  Lauch Faircloth Republican -- term not up
57  James B. Hunt, Jr. Democratic -- term not up

North Carolina 05
31  A.P. "Sandy" Sands Democratic candidate
32  Richard Burr  Republican candidate
18  Jesse Helms   Republican -- term not up
28  Lauch Faircloth Republican -- term not up
57  James B. Hunt, Jr. Democratic -- term not up

North Carolina 07
33  Charlie Rose   Democratic incumbent
36  Robert C. Anderson Republican challenger
18  Jesse Helms   Republican -- term not up
28  Lauch Faircloth Republican -- term not up
57  James B. Hunt, Jr. Democratic -- term not up

North Carolina 08
33  W.G. "Bill" Hefner Democratic incumbent
36  Sherrill Morgan Republican challenger
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North Carolina 09
31 Rory Blake Democratic candidate
32 Sue Myrick Republican candidate
18 Jesse Helms Republican -- term not up
28 Lauch Faircloth Republican -- term not up
57 James B. Hunt, Jr. Democratic -- term not up

Nebraska 01
35 Patrick Combs Democratic challenger
34 Doug Bereuter Republican incumbent
13 Bob Kerrey Democratic incumbent
16 Jan Stoney Republican challenger
19 J. James Exon Democratic -- term not up
53 Ben Nelson Democratic incumbent
56 Gene Spence Republican challenger

New Hampshire 01
35 Bill Verge Democratic challenger
34 Bill Zeliff Republican incumbent
18 Bob Smith Republican -- term not up
28 Judd Gregg Republican -- term not up
55 Wayne D. King Democratic challenger
54 Stephen Merrill Republican incumbent

New Hampshire 02
33 Dick Swett Democratic incumbent
36 Charles Bass Republican challenger
18 Bob Smith Republican -- term not up
28 Judd Gregg Republican -- term not up
55 Wayne D. King Democratic challenger
54 Stephen Merrill Republican incumbent

New Jersey 01
33 Robert E. Andrews Democratic incumbent
36 James N. Hogan Republican challenger
13 Frank R. Lautenberg Democratic incumbent
16 Garabed "Chuck" Hayt Republican challenger
19 Bill Bradley Democratic -- term not up
58 Christine Todd Whitman Republican -- term not up

New Jersey 02
31 Louis N. Magazzu Democratic candidate
32 Frank A. LoBiondo Republican candidate
13 Frank R. Lautenberg Democratic incumbent
16 Garabed "Chuck" Hayt Republican challenger
19 Bill Bradley Democratic -- term not up
58 Christine Todd Whitman Republican -- term not up

New Jersey 05
35 Bill Auer Democratic challenger
34 Marge Roukema Republican incumbent
13 Frank R. Lautenberg Democratic incumbent
16 Garabed "Chuck" Hayt Republican challenger
19 Bill Bradley Democratic -- term not up
58 Christine Todd Whitman Republican -- term not up
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>Karen Carroll</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bob Franks</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frank R. Lautenberg</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Garabed &quot;Chuck&quot; Hayt</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Bradley</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christine Todd Whitman</td>
<td>Republican --term not up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>Robert G. Torricelli</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peter J. Russo</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frank R. Lautenberg</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Garabed &quot;Chuck&quot; Hayt</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Bradley</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christine Todd Whitman</td>
<td>Republican --term not up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Donald M. Payne</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Ford</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frank R. Lautenberg</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Garabed &quot;Chuck&quot; Hayt</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Bradley</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christine Todd Whitman</td>
<td>Republican --term not up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Frank Herbert</td>
<td>Democratic candidate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rodney P. Frelinghuy</td>
<td>Republican candidate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frank R. Lautenberg</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Garabed &quot;Chuck&quot; Hayt</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Bradley</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christine Todd Whitman</td>
<td>Republican --term not up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Robert Menendez</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fernando A. Alonso</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frank R. Lautenberg</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Garabed &quot;Chuck&quot; Hayt</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Bradley</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christine Todd Whitman</td>
<td>Republican --term not up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>George J. Hochbrueck</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Forbes</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Patrick Moynihan</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bernadette Castro</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alfonse M. D'Amato</td>
<td>Republican -- term not up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mario M. Cuomo</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>George E. Pataki</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>James Manfre</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rick A. Lazio</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Patrick Moynihan</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bernadette Castro</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alfonse M. D'Amato</td>
<td>Republican -- term not up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mario M. Cuomo</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>George E. Pataki</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New York  03
35  Norma Grill    Democratic challenger
34  Peter T. King  Republican incumbent
13  Daniel Patrick Moynihan Democratic incumbent
16  Bernadette Castro Republican challenger
29  Alfonse M. D'Amato Republican -- term not up
53  Mario M. Cuomo  Democratic incumbent
56  George E. Pataki Republican challenger

New York  04
31  Ferne Steckler Democratic candidate
32  Daniel Frisa    Republican candidate
13  Daniel Patrick Moynihan Democratic incumbent
16  Bernadette Castro Republican challenger
29  Alfonse M. D'Amato Republican -- term not up
53  Mario M. Cuomo  Democratic incumbent
56  George E. Pataki Republican challenger

New York  05
33  Gary Ackerman Democratic incumbent
36  Grant M. Lally  Republican challenger
13  Daniel Patrick Moynihan Democratic incumbent
16  Bernadette Castro Republican challenger
29  Alfonse M. D'Amato Republican -- term not up
53  Mario M. Cuomo  Democratic incumbent
56  George E. Pataki Republican challenger

New York  06
33  Floyd H. Flake Democratic incumbent
36  Denny D. Bhagwandin Republican challenger
13  Daniel Patrick Moynihan Democratic incumbent
16  Bernadette Castro Republican challenger
29  Alfonse M. D'Amato Republican -- term not up
53  Mario M. Cuomo  Democratic incumbent
56  George E. Pataki Republican challenger

New York  07
33  Thomas J. Manton Democratic incumbent
13  Daniel Patrick Moynihan Democratic incumbent
16  Bernadette Castro Republican challenger
29  Alfonse M. D'Amato Republican -- term not up
53  Mario M. Cuomo  Democratic incumbent
56  George E. Pataki Republican challenger

New York  08
33  Jerrold Nadler Democratic incumbent
36  David Askren    Republican challenger
13  Daniel Patrick Moynihan Democratic incumbent
16  Bernadette Castro Republican challenger
29  Alfonse M. D'Amato Republican -- term not up
53  Mario M. Cuomo  Democratic incumbent
56  George E. Pataki Republican challenger

New York  10
33  Edolphus Towns Democratic incumbent
36  Amelia Smith Parker Republican challenger
13  Daniel Patrick Moynihan Democratic incumbent
16  Bernadette Castro Republican challenger
29  Alfonse M. D'Amato Republican -- term not up
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Mario M. Cuomo</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>George E. Pataki</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Major R. Owens</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Gary S. Popkin</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Daniel Patrick Moynihan</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Bernadette Castro</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Alfonse M. D'Amato</td>
<td>Republican -- term not up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Mario M. Cuomo</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>George E. Pataki</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Carolyn B. Maloney</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Charles Millard</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Daniel Patrick Moynihan</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Bernadette Castro</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Alfonse M. D'Amato</td>
<td>Republican -- term not up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Mario M. Cuomo</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>George E. Pataki</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Jose E. Serrano</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Daniel Patrick Moynihan</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Bernadette Castro</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Alfonse M. D'Amato</td>
<td>Republican -- term not up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Mario M. Cuomo</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>William A. Long Jr.</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Bill Paxon</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13  Daniel Patrick Moynihan  Democratic incumbent
16  Bernadette Castro  Republican challenger
29  Alfonse M. D'Amato  Republican -- term not up
53  Mario M. Cuomo  Democratic incumbent
56  George E. Pataki  Republican challenger

New York  29
13  Daniel Patrick Moynihan  Democratic incumbent
16  Bernadette Castro  Republican challenger
29  Alfonse M. D'Amato  Republican -- term not up
53  Mario M. Cuomo  Democratic incumbent
56  George E. Pataki  Republican challenger

New York  30
13  Daniel Patrick Moynihan  Democratic incumbent
16  Bernadette Castro  Republican challenger
29  Alfonse M. D'Amato  Republican -- term not up
53  Mario M. Cuomo  Democratic incumbent
56  George E. Pataki  Republican challenger

New York  31
13  Daniel Patrick Moynihan  Democratic incumbent
16  Bernadette Castro  Republican challenger
29  Alfonse M. D'Amato  Republican -- term not up
53  Mario M. Cuomo  Democratic incumbent
56  George E. Pataki  Republican challenger

Ohio  03
11  Joel Hyatt  Democratic candidate
19  John H. Glenn, Jr.  Democratic -- term not up
54  George V. Voinovich  Republican incumbent

Ohio  07
11  Joel Hyatt  Democratic candidate
19  John H. Glenn, Jr.  Democratic -- term not up
54  George V. Voinovich  Republican incumbent

Ohio  08
11  Joel Hyatt  Democratic candidate
19  John H. Glenn, Jr.  Democratic -- term not up
55  Robert L. Burch, Jr  Democratic challenger
54  George V. Voinovich  Republican incumbent

Ohio  18
31  Greg L. DiDonato  Democratic candidate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Candidate 1</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Candidate 2</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Bob Ney</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Joel Hyatt</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mike DeWine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John H. Glenn, Jr.</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert L. Burch, Jr</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>George V. Voinovich</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stuart Price</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Steve Largent</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dave McCurdy</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>James Inhofe</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Don Nickles</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jack Mildren</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frank Keating</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>Virgil R. Cooper</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tom Coburn</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dave McCurdy</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>James Inhofe</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Don Nickles</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jack Mildren</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frank Keating</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Elizabeth Furse</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Witt</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mark O. Hatfield</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bob Packwood</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Kitzhaber</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Denny Smith</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>Ron Wyden</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Everett Hall</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mark O. Hatfield</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bob Packwood</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Kitzhaber</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Denny Smith</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>Peter A. DeFazio</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John D. Newkirk</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mark O. Hatfield</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bob Packwood</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Kitzhaber</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Denny Smith</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Thomas M. Foglietta</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Roger Gordon</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Harris Wofford</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Rick Santorum</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Arlen Specter</td>
<td>Republican -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Mark Singel</td>
<td>Democratic candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Tom Ridge</td>
<td>Republican candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pennsylvania 02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Chaka Fattah</td>
<td>Democratic candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Lawrence R. Watson</td>
<td>Republican candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Harris Wofford</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Rick Santorum</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Arlen Specter</td>
<td>Republican -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Mark Singel</td>
<td>Democratic candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Tom Ridge</td>
<td>Republican candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pennsylvania 08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>John P. Murray</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>James C. Greenwood</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Harris Wofford</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Rick Santorum</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Arlen Specter</td>
<td>Republican -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Mark Singel</td>
<td>Democratic candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Tom Ridge</td>
<td>Republican candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pennsylvania 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>John P. Murtha</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Bill Choby</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Harris Wofford</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Rick Santorum</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Arlen Specter</td>
<td>Republican -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Mark Singel</td>
<td>Democratic candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Tom Ridge</td>
<td>Republican candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pennsylvania 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Marjorie Margolies-M</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Jon D. Fox</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Harris Wofford</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Rick Santorum</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Arlen Specter</td>
<td>Republican -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Mark Singel</td>
<td>Democratic candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Tom Ridge</td>
<td>Republican candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pennsylvania 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>William J. Coyne</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>John Robert Clark</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Harris Wofford</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Rick Santorum</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Arlen Specter</td>
<td>Republican -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Mark Singel</td>
<td>Democratic candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Tom Ridge</td>
<td>Republican candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pennsylvania 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>George W. Gekas</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Harris Wofford</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Rick Santorum</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Arlen Specter</td>
<td>Republican -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Mark Singel</td>
<td>Democratic candidate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
52     Tom Ridge              Republican candidate

Pennsylvania  18
31     Mike Doyle             Democratic candidate
32     John McCarty           Republican candidate
13     Harris Wofford         Democratic incumbent
16     Rick Santorum          Republican challenger
29     Arlen Specter          Republican -- term not up
51     Mark Singel            Democratic candidate
52     Tom Ridge              Republican candidate

South Dakota  01
33     Tim Johnson            Democratic incumbent
36     Jan Berkhout           Republican challenger
17     Thomas Daschle         Democratic -- term not up
18     Larry Pressler         Republican -- term not up
51     Jim Beddow             Democratic candidate
52     William J. Janklow     Republican candidate

Tennessee    02
34     John J. "Jimmy" Duncan   Republican incumbent
13     Jim Sasser             Democratic incumbent
16     Bill Frist             Republican challenger
11a    Jim Cooper             Democratic candidate
12a    Fred Thompson          Republican candidate
51     Phil Bredesen          Democratic candidate
52     Don Sundquist          Republican candidate

Tennessee    03
31     Randy Button           Democratic candidate
32     Zach Wamp              Republican candidate
13     Jim Sasser             Democratic incumbent
16     Bill Frist             Republican challenger
11a    Jim Cooper             Democratic candidate
12a    Fred Thompson          Republican candidate
51     Phil Bredesen          Democratic candidate
52     Don Sundquist          Republican candidate

Tennessee    04
31     Jeff Whorley           Democratic candidate
32     Van Hilleary           Republican candidate
13     Jim Sasser             Democratic incumbent
16     Bill Frist             Republican challenger
11a    Jim Cooper             Democratic candidate
12a    Fred Thompson          Republican candidate
51     Phil Bredesen          Democratic candidate
52     Don Sundquist          Republican candidate

Tennessee    05
33     Bob Clement            Democratic incumbent
36     John Osborne           Republican challenger
13     Jim Sasser             Democratic incumbent
16     Bill Frist             Republican challenger
11a    Jim Cooper             Democratic candidate
12a    Fred Thompson          Republican candidate
51     Phil Bredesen          Democratic candidate
52     Don Sundquist          Republican candidate

Texas        01
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Challenger</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Incumbent Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Sam Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Terry Jesmore</td>
<td></td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Bill Archer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Jack Fields</td>
<td></td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Jack Brooks</td>
<td></td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Chet Edwards</td>
<td></td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>Challenger</td>
<td>Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Pete Geren</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td>Ernest J. Anderson</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Richard Fisher</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
<td>Kay Bailey Hutchinson</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Phil Gramm</td>
<td>Republican -- term not up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Ann W. Richards</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td>George W. Bush</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Bill Sarpalius</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td>William M. &quot;Mac&quot; Thornberry</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Richard Fisher</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Kay Bailey Hutchinson</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Phil Gramm</td>
<td>Republican -- term not up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Ann W. Richards</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td>George W. Bush</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Greg Laughlin</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td>Jim Deats</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Richard Fisher</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Kay Bailey Hutchinson</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Phil Gramm</td>
<td>Republican -- term not up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Ann W. Richards</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td>George W. Bush</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>E. &quot;Kika&quot; de la Garza</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td>Tom Haughey</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Richard Fisher</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Phil Gramm</td>
<td>Republican -- term not up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Ann W. Richards</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td>George W. Bush</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sheila Jackson Lee</td>
<td>Democratic candidate</td>
<td>Jerry Burley</td>
<td>Republican candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Richard Fisher</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Kay Bailey Hutchinson</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Phil Gramm</td>
<td>Republican -- term not up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Ann W. Richards</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td>George W. Bush</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Lamar Smith</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Richard Fisher</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Kay Bailey Hutchinson</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Phil Gramm</td>
<td>Republican -- term not up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Ann W. Richards</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
<td>George W. Bush</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Ken Bentsen</td>
<td>Democratic candidate</td>
<td>Gene Fontenot</td>
<td>Republican candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Richard Fisher</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Kay Bailey Hutchinson</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
29  Phil Gramm  Republican -- term not up  
53  Ann W. Richards  Democratic incumbent  
56  George W. Bush  Republican challenger  

Texas  26  
35  LeEarl Ann Bryant  Democratic challenger  
34  Dick Armey  Republican incumbent  
15  Richard Fisher  Democratic challenger  
14  Kay Bailey Hutchinson  Republican incumbent  
29  Phil Gramm  Republican -- term not up  
53  Ann W. Richards  Democratic incumbent  
56  George W. Bush  Republican challenger  

Texas  29  
33  Gene Green  Democratic incumbent  
36  Harold "Oilman" Eide  Republican challenger  
15  Richard Fisher  Democratic challenger  
14  Kay Bailey Hutchinson  Republican incumbent  
29  Phil Gramm  Republican -- term not up  
53  Ann W. Richards  Democratic incumbent  
56  George W. Bush  Republican challenger  

Texas  30  
33  Eddie Bernice Johnson  Democratic incumbent  
36  Lucy Cain  Republican challenger  
15  Richard Fisher  Democratic challenger  
14  Kay Bailey Hutchinson  Republican incumbent  
29  Phil Gramm  Republican -- term not up  
53  Ann W. Richards  Democratic incumbent  
56  George W. Bush  Republican challenger  

Utah  02  
33  Karen Shepherd  Democratic incumbent  
36  Enid Greene Waldholt  Republican challenger  
15  Patrick A. Shea  Democratic challenger  
14  Orrin G. Hatch  Republican incumbent  
29  Robert F. Bennett  Republican -- term not up  
58  Micheal O. Leavitt  Republican --term not up  

Virginia  01  
35  Mary Sinclair  Democratic challenger  
34  Herb Bateman  Republican incumbent  
13  Charles S. Robb  Democratic incumbent  
16  Oliver North  Republican challenger  
29  John W. Warner  Republican -- term not up  
26  J. Marshall Coleman  Independent challenger  
58  George F. Allen  Republican --term not up  

Virginia  03  
33  Robert C. (Bobby) Sc  Democratic incumbent  
36  Tom Ward  Republican challenger  
13  Charles S. Robb  Democratic incumbent  
16  Oliver North  Republican challenger  
29  John W. Warner  Republican -- term not up  
26  J. Marshall Coleman  Independent challenger  
58  George F. Allen  Republican --term not up  

Virginia  04  
33  Norman Sisisky  Democratic incumbent  

36 George Sweet  Republican challenger
13 Charles S. Robb  Democratic incumbent
16 Oliver North  Republican challenger
29 John W. Warner  Republican -- term not up
26 J. Marshall Coleman  Independent challenger
58 George F. Allen  Republican -- term not up

Virginia 07
35 Gerald Berg  Democratic challenger
34 Thomas J. Bliley, Jr  Republican incumbent
13 Charles S. Robb  Democratic incumbent
16 Oliver North  Republican challenger
29 John W. Warner  Republican -- term not up
26 J. Marshall Coleman  Independent challenger
58 George F. Allen  Republican -- term not up

Virginia 08
33 James P. Moran, Jr.  Democratic incumbent
34 Kyle McSlarrow  Republican challenger
13 Charles S. Robb  Democratic incumbent
16 Oliver North  Republican challenger
29 John W. Warner  Republican -- term not up
26 J. Marshall Coleman  Independent challenger
58 George F. Allen  Republican -- term not up

Virginia 09
33 Rick Boucher  Democratic incumbent
34 Steve Fast  Republican challenger
13 Charles S. Robb  Democratic incumbent
16 Oliver North  Republican challenger
29 John W. Warner  Republican -- term not up
26 J. Marshall Coleman  Independent challenger
58 George F. Allen  Republican -- term not up

Virginia 10
30 Alan Ogden  Independent challenger
34 Frank R. Wolf  Republican incumbent
13 Charles S. Robb  Democratic incumbent
16 Oliver North  Republican challenger
29 John W. Warner  Republican -- term not up
26 J. Marshall Coleman  Independent challenger
58 George F. Allen  Republican -- term not up

Washington 01
33 Maria Cantwell  Democratic incumbent
36 Rick White  Republican challenger
15 Ron Sims  Democratic challenger
14 Slade Gorton  Republican incumbent
19 Patty Murray  Democratic -- term not up
57 Michael Lowry  Democratic -- term not up

Washington 02
31 Harriet A. Spanel  Democratic candidate
32 Jack Metcalf  Republican candidate
15 Ron Sims  Democratic challenger
14 Slade Gorton  Republican incumbent
19 Patty Murray  Democratic -- term not up
57 Michael Lowry  Democratic -- term not up
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington 07</td>
<td>Jim McDermott</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keith Harris</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ron Sims</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slade Gorton</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patty Murray</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Lowry</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington 08</td>
<td>Jim Wyrick</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jennifer Dunn</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ron Sims</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slade Gorton</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patty Murray</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Lowry</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington 09</td>
<td>Mike Kriedler</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Randy Tate</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ron Sims</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slade Gorton</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patty Murray</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Lowry</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin 01</td>
<td>Peter W. Barca</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark W. Neumann</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Herb Kohl</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert T. Welch</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russell Feingold</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chuck Chvala</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tommy G. Thompson</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin 04</td>
<td>Gerald D. Kleczka</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tom Reynolds</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Herb Kohl</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert T. Welch</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russell Feingold</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chuck Chvala</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tommy G. Thompson</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin 05</td>
<td>Thomas M. Barrett</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen B. Hollingsh</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Herb Kohl</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert T. Welch</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russell Feingold</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chuck Chvala</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tommy G. Thompson</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin 09</td>
<td>F. James Sensenbrenner</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Herb Kohl</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert T. Welch</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russell Feingold</td>
<td>Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chuck Chvala</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tommy G. Thompson</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Congressional District</td>
<td>Names for U.S. Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Alan B. Mollohan Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert C. Byrd Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John D. Rockefeller Democratic -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Bob Schuster Democratic candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mike Sullivan Democratic candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alan Simpson Republican -- term not up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Geringer Republican candidate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1996 CANDIDATE LISTS AND SAMPLE BALLOT CARDS

State: Alabama Congressional District: 3

(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
11 Roger Bedford Democratic candidate
12 Jeff Sessions Republican candidate
21 Howell Heflin Democrat -- retiring

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
31 T.D. (Ted) Little Democratic candidate
32 Bob Riley Republican candidate
41 Glen Browder Democrat -- retiring

State: Alabama Congressional District: 4

(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
11 Roger Bedford Democratic candidate
12 Jeff Sessions Republican candidate
21 Howell Heflin Democrat -- retiring

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
31 Robert T. Wilson Jr. Democratic candidate
32 Robert Aderholt Republican candidate
41 Tom Bevill Democrat -- retiring

State: Alabama Congressional District: 5

(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
11 Roger Bedford Democratic candidate
12 Jeff Sessions Republican candidate
21 Howell Heflin Democrat -- retiring

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33 Bud Cramer Democratic incumbent
36 Wayne Parker Republican challenger

State: Alabama Congressional District: 6

(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
11 Roger Bedford Democratic candidate
12 Jeff Sessions Republican candidate
21 Howell Heflin Democrat -- retiring

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35 Mary Lynn Bates Democratic challenger
34 Spencer Bachus Republican incumbent

State: Alabama Congressional District: 7
### Names for U.S. Senate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roger Bedford</td>
<td>Democratic candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jeff Sessions</td>
<td>Republican candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Howell Heflin</td>
<td>Democrat -- retiring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Names for U.S. House of Representatives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Earl E. Hilliard</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Joe Powell</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Matt Salmon</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ed Pastor</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jim Buster</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Steve Owens</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>J.D. Hayworth</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Vincent Tolliver</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jay Dickey</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Vic Fazio</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tim LeFever</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Katie Hirning</td>
<td>Democratic challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>John T. Doolittle</td>
<td>Republican incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lynn Woolsey</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Duane C. Hughes</td>
<td>Republican challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nancy Pelosi</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
State: California  Congressional District: 9
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  Ronald V. Dellums  Democratic incumbent
36  Deborah Wright  Republican challenger

State: California  Congressional District: 10
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  Ellen O. Tauscher  Democratic challenger
34  Bill Baker  Republican incumbent

State: California  Congressional District: 12
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  Tom Lantos  Democratic incumbent
36  Storm Jenkins  Republican challenger

State: California  Congressional District: 13
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  Pete Stark  Democratic incumbent
36  James S. Fay  Republican challenger

State: California  Congressional District: 17
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  Sam Farr  Democratic incumbent
36  Jess Brown  Republican challenger

State: California  Congressional District: 19
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  Paul Barile  Democratic challenger
34  George P. Radanovich  Republican incumbent

State: California  Congressional District: 20
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  Cal Dooley  Democratic incumbent
36  Trice Harvey  Republican challenger

State: California  Congressional District: 25
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  Diane Trautman  Democratic challenger
34  Howard P. 'Buck' McKeon  Republican incumbent

State: California  Congressional District: 26
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  Howard L. Berman  Democratic incumbent
36  Bill Glass  Republican challenger

State: California  Congressional District: 27
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
31  Doug Kahn  Democratic candidate
32  James E. Rogan  Republican candidate
42  Carlos J. Moorhead  Republican -- retiring

State: California  Congressional District: 28
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  David Levering  Democratic challenger
34  David Dreier  Republican incumbent

State: California  Congressional District: 29
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Congressional District</th>
<th>Republican challenger</th>
<th>Democratic incumbent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Paul Stepanek</td>
<td>Henry A. Waxman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Julian C. Dixon</td>
<td>Larry Ardito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Maxine Waters</td>
<td>Eric Carlson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Rick Zbur</td>
<td>Robert (Bob) Conaway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>R.O. (Bob) Davis</td>
<td>Robert K. Dornan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Linda M. Wilde</td>
<td>Robert K. Dornan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Loretta Sanchez</td>
<td>Dana Rohrabacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Sonny Bono</td>
<td>Dana Rohrabacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Robert (Bob) Conaway</td>
<td>Dana Rohrabacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Jerry Lewis</td>
<td>Dana Rohrabacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Linda M. Wilde</td>
<td>Dana Rohrabacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Sonny Bono</td>
<td>Dana Rohrabacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Robert K. Dornan</td>
<td>Dana Rohrabacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Robert K. Dornan</td>
<td>Dana Rohrabacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Robert K. Dornan</td>
<td>Dana Rohrabacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
State:  California      Congressional District:  47
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35      Tina Louise Laine       Democratic challenger
34      Christopher Cox         Republican incumbent

State:  California      Congressional District:  48
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35      Dan Farrell             Democratic challenger
34      Ron Packard             Republican incumbent

State:  California      Congressional District:  51
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35      Rita Tamerius           Democratic challenger
34      Randy (Duke) Cunningham Republican incumbent

State:  Colorado        Congressional District:  1
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
11      Tom Strickland          Democratic candidate
12      Wayne Allard             Republican candidate
22      Hank Brown               Republican -- retiring
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
31      Diana Degette           Democratic candidate
32      Joe Rogers              Republican candidate
41      Pat Schroeder           Democrat -- retiring

State:  Colorado        Congressional District:  2
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
11      Tom Strickland          Democratic candidate
12      Wayne Allard             Republican candidate
22      Hank Brown               Republican -- retiring
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33      David E. Skaggs          Democratic incumbent
36      Pat Miller              Republican challenger

State:  Colorado        Congressional District:  4
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
11      Tom Strickland          Democratic candidate
12      Wayne Allard             Republican candidate
22      Hank Brown               Republican -- retiring
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
31      Guy Kelley              Democratic candidate
32      Bob Schaffer            Republican candidate
42      Wayne Allard             Republican -- retiring

State:  Colorado        Congressional District:  5
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
11      Tom Strickland          Democratic candidate
12      Wayne Allard             Republican candidate
22      Hank Brown               Republican -- retiring
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35      Mike Robinson           Democratic challenger
34      Joel Hefley             Republican incumbent

State:  Colorado        Congressional District:  6
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
11      Tom Strickland          Democratic candidate
12      Wayne Allard             Republican candidate
22      Hank Brown               Republican -- retiring
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:

35      Joan Fitz-Gerald        Democratic challenger
34      Dan Schaefer            Republican incumbent

State: Connecticut  Congressional District: 3
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33      Rosa DeLauro            Democratic incumbent
36      John Coppola            Republican challenger

State: Connecticut  Congressional District: 5
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35      James H. Maloney        Democratic challenger
34      Gary A. Franks          Republican incumbent

State: Florida        Congressional District: 2
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
31      Allen Boyd              Democratic candidate
32      Bill Sutton             Republican candidate
41      Pete Peterson           Democrat -- retiring

State: Florida        Congressional District: 12
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35      Mike Canady             Democratic challenger
34      Charles T. Canady       Republican incumbent

State: Florida        Congressional District: 13
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35      Sanford Gordon          Democratic challenger
34      Dan Miller              Republican incumbent

State: Florida        Congressional District: 15
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35      John L. Byron           Democratic challenger
34      David Weldon            Republican incumbent

State: Florida        Congressional District: 17
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33      Carrie P. Meek          Democratic incumbent
36      Wellington Rolle        Republican challenger

State: Florida        Congressional District: 18
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
34      Ileana Ros-Lehtinen      Republican incumbent

State: Florida        Congressional District: 21
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
34      Lincoln Diaz-Balart     Republican incumbent

State: Florida        Congressional District: 23
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33      Alcee L. Hastings        Democratic incumbent
36      Robert Paul Brown       Republican challenger

State: Florida        Congressional District: 3
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33      Corrine Brown           Democratic incumbent
36      Preston James Fields    Republican challenger

State: Florida        Congressional District: 4
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
State: Florida  Congressional District: 6
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  Newell O'Brien   Democratic challenger
34  Cliff Stearns   Republican incumbent

State: Florida  Congressional District: 8
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  Al Krulick   Democratic challenger
34  Bill McCollum   Republican incumbent

State: Georgia  Congressional District: 1
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
11  Max Cleland   Democratic candidate
12  Guy Millner   Republican candidate
21  Sam Nunn   Democrat -- retiring
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  Rosemary Kaszans   Democratic challenger
34  Jack Kingston   Republican incumbent

State: Georgia  Congressional District: 2
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
11  Max Cleland   Democratic candidate
12  Guy Millner   Republican candidate
21  Sam Nunn   Democrat -- retiring
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  Sanford Bishop   Democratic incumbent
36  Darrel Ealum   Republican challenger

State: Georgia  Congressional District: 3
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
11  Max Cleland   Democratic candidate
12  Guy Millner   Republican candidate
21  Sam Nunn   Democrat -- retiring
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  Jim Chafin   Democratic challenger
34  Mac Collins   Republican incumbent

State: Georgia  Congressional District: 4
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
11  Max Cleland   Democratic candidate
12  Guy Millner   Republican candidate
21  Sam Nunn   Democrat -- retiring
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  Cynthia McKinney   Democratic incumbent
36  John Mitnick   Republican challenger

State: Georgia  Congressional District: 5
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
11  Max Cleland   Democratic candidate
12  Guy Millner   Republican candidate
21  Sam Nunn   Democrat -- retiring
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  John Lewis   Democratic incumbent

State: Georgia  Congressional District: 6
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:

11      Max Cleland             Democratic candidate
12      Guy Millner             Republican candidate
21      Sam Nunn                Democrat -- retriing
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35      Michael Coles           Democratic challenger
34      Newt Gingrich           Republican incumbent

State:  Georgia         Congressional District: 7
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
11      Max Cleland             Democratic candidate
12      Guy Millner             Republican candidate
21      Sam Nunn                Democrat -- retriing
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35      Charlie Watts           Democratic challenger
34      Bob Barr                Republican incumbent

State:  Georgia         Congressional District: 9
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
11      Max Cleland             Democratic candidate
12      Guy Millner             Republican candidate
21      Sam Nunn                Democrat -- retriing
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35      McCracken (Ken) Poston  Democratic challenger
34      Nathan Deal             Republican incumbent

State:  Hawaii          Congressional District: 2
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33      Patsy T. Mink           Democratic incumbent
36      Tom Pico Jr.            Republican challenger

State:  Illinois        Congressional District: 1
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
11      Richard J. Durbin       Democratic candidate
12      Albert Salvi            Republican candidate
21      Paul Simon              Democrat -- retriing
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33      Bobby L. Rush           Democratic incumbent
36      Noel Naughton           Republican challenger

State:  Illinois        Congressional District: 2
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
11      Richard J. Durbin       Democratic candidate
12      Albert Salvi            Republican candidate
21      Paul Simon              Democrat -- retriing
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33      Jesse Jackson Jr.       Democratic incumbent
36      Thomas Joseph Somer     Republican challenger

State:  Illinois        Congressional District: 3
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
11      Richard J. Durbin       Democratic candidate
12      Albert Salvi            Republican candidate
21      Paul Simon              Democrat -- retriing
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33      William O. Lipinski     Democratic incumbent
36      Jim Nalepa              Republican challenger

State:  Illinois        Congressional District: 4
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
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(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33 Luis V. Gutierrez Democratic incumbent
36 Thomas Mendoza Jr. Republican challenger

State: Illinois  Congressional District: 5
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
11 Richard J. Durbin Democratic candidate
12 Albert Salvi Republican candidate
21 Paul Simon Democrat -- retiring
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35 Rod R. Blagojevich Democratic challenger
34 Michael Patrick Flanagan Republican incumbent

State: Illinois  Congressional District: 6
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
11 Richard J. Durbin Democratic candidate
12 Albert Salvi Republican candidate
21 Paul Simon Democrat -- retiring
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35 Stephen de la Rosa Democratic challenger
34 Henry J. Hyde Republican incumbent

State: Illinois  Congressional District: 7
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
11 Richard J. Durbin Democratic candidate
12 Albert Salvi Republican candidate
21 Paul Simon Democrat -- retiring
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
31 Danny K. Davis Democratic candidate
32 Randy Borow Republican candidate
41 Cardiss Collins Democrat -- retiring

State: Illinois  Congressional District: 9
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
11 Richard J. Durbin Democratic candidate
12 Albert Salvi Republican candidate
21 Paul Simon Democrat -- retiring
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33 Sidney R. Yates Democratic incumbent
36 Joseph Walsh Republican challenger

State: Illinois  Congressional District: 10
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
11 Richard J. Durbin Democratic candidate
12 Albert Salvi Republican candidate
21 Paul Simon Democrat -- retiring
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35 Philip R. Torf Democratic challenger
34 John Edward Porter Republican incumbent

State: Illinois  Congressional District: 11
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
11 Richard J. Durbin Democratic candidate
12 Albert Salvi Republican candidate
21 Paul Simon Democrat -- retiring
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
State: Illinois
Congressional District: 12

(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
11 Richard J. Durbin Democratic candidate
12 Albert Salvi Republican candidate
21 Paul Simon Democrat -- retiring

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33 Jerry F. Costello Democratic incumbent
36 Shapley R. Hunter Republican challenger

State: Illinois
Congressional District: 19

(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
11 Richard J. Durbin Democratic candidate
12 Albert Salvi Republican candidate
21 Paul Simon Democrat -- retiring

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33 Glenn Poshard Democratic incumbent
36 Brent Winters Republican challenger

State: Illinois
Congressional District: 20

(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
11 Richard J. Durbin Democratic candidate
12 Albert Salvi Republican candidate
21 Paul Simon Democrat -- retiring

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
31 Jay C. Hoffman Democratic candidate
32 John M. Shimkus Republican candidate
41 Richard J. Durbin Democrat -- retiring

State: Indiana
Congressional District: 1

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33 Peter J. Visclosky Democratic incumbent
36 Michael Edward Petyo Republican challenger

State: Indiana
Congressional District: 2

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35 R. Marc Carmichael Democratic challenger
34 David M. McIntosh Republican incumbent

State: Indiana
Congressional District: 4

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35 Gerald L. Houseman Democratic challenger
34 Marc Edward Souder Republican incumbent

State: Indiana
Congressional District: 6

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35 Carrie Dillard Trammel Democratic challenger
34 Dan Burton Republican incumbent

State: Indiana
Congressional District: 7

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
31 Robert F. Hellmann Democratic candidate
32 Edward A. Pease Republican candidate
42 John T. Myers Republican -- retiring

State: Indiana
Congressional District: 9

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
State: Iowa  Congressional District: 3
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
13  Tom Harkin  Democratic incumbent
16  Jim Ross Lightfoot  Republican challenger

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
31  Leonard L. Boswell  Democratic candidate
32  Mike Mahaffey  Republican candidate
42  Jim Lightfoot  Republican -- retiring

State: Iowa  Congressional District: 4
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
13  Tom Harkin  Democratic incumbent
16  Jim Ross Lightfoot  Republican challenger

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  Connie McBurney  Democratic challenger
34  Greg Ganske  Republican incumbent

State: Kansas  Congressional District: 3
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
11  Sally Thompson  Democratic candidate
12  Pat Roberts  Republican candidate
22  Nancy Kassebaum  Republican -- retiring
93  Jill Docking  Democratic candidate
94  Sam Brownback  Republican candidate
96  Bob Dole  Republican -- retiring

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
31  Judy Hancock  Democratic candidate
32  Vince K. Snowbarger  Republican candidate
42  Jan Meyers  Republican -- retiring

State: Louisiana  Congressional District: 4
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
11  Mary L. Landrieu  Democratic candidate
12  Louis (Woody) Jenkins  Republican candidate
21  Bennett Johnston  Democrat -- retiring

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  Paul M. Chachere  Democratic challenger
34  Jim McCrery  Republican incumbent

State: Maryland  Congressional District: 1
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  Steven R. Eastaugh  Democratic challenger
34  Wayne T. Gilchrest  Republican incumbent

State: Maryland  Congressional District: 2
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  Connie DeJuliis  Democratic challenger
34  Robert L. Ehrlich Jr.  Republican incumbent

State: Maryland  Congressional District: 3
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  Benjamin L. Cardin  Democratic incumbent
36  Patrick L. McDonough  Republican challenger

State: Maryland  Congressional District: 4
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Second Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Albert R. Wynn</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>John B. Kimble</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Steny H. Hoyer</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>John S. Morgan</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Stephen Crawford</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Roscoe G. Bartlett</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Elijah E. Cummings</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kenneth Kondner</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kweisi Mfume</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>-- retiring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Donald Mooers</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Constance A. Morella</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>John Kerry</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>William F. Weld</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>John W. Olver</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jane Swift</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Richard E. Neal</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Peter G. Torkildsen</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jim McGovern</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Peter I. Blute</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>John Tierney</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>challenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Peter G. Torkildsen</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>John Kerry</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>William F. Weld</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>challenger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16  William F. Weld  Republican challenger

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  Joseph P. Kennedy II  Democratic incumbent
36  R. Philip Hyde  Republican challenger

State: Massachusetts  Congressional District: 9

(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
13  John Kerry  Democratic incumbent
16  William F. Weld  Republican challenger

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  Joe Moakley  Democratic incumbent
36  Paul Gryska  Republican challenger

State: Massachusetts  Congressional District: 10

(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
13  John Kerry  Democratic incumbent
16  William F. Weld  Republican challenger

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
31  Phil Johnston  Democratic candidate
32  Edward Teague  Republican candidate
41  Gerry E. Studds  Democrat -- retiring

State: Michigan  Congressional District: 2

(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
13  Carl Levin  Democratic incumbent
16  Ronna Romney  Republican challenger

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  Dan Kruszynski  Democratic challenger
34  Peter Hoekstra  Republican incumbent

State: Michigan  Congressional District: 3

(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
13  Carl Levin  Democratic incumbent
16  Ronna Romney  Republican challenger

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  Betsy J. Flory  Democratic challenger
34  Vernon J. Ehlers  Republican incumbent

State: Michigan  Congressional District: 4

(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
13  Carl Levin  Democratic incumbent
16  Ronna Romney  Republican challenger

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  Lisa A. Donaldson  Democratic challenger
34  Dave Camp  Republican incumbent

State: Michigan  Congressional District: 5

(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
13  Carl Levin  Democratic incumbent
16  Ronna Romney  Republican challenger

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  James A. Barcia  Democratic incumbent
36  Lawrence H. Sims  Republican challenger

State: Michigan  Congressional District: 7

(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
13  Carl Levin  Democratic incumbent
16  Ronna Romney  Republican challenger

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
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35 Kim H. Tunnicliff Democratic challenger
34 Nick Smith Republican incumbent

State: Michigan  Congressional District: 9
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
13 Carl Levin Democratic incumbent
16 Ronna Romney Republican challenger
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33 Dale E. Kildee Democratic incumbent
36 Patrick M. Nowak Republican challenger

State: Michigan  Congressional District: 10
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
13 Carl Levin Democratic incumbent
16 Ronna Romney Republican challenger
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33 David E. Bonior Democratic incumbent
36 Susy Heintz Republican challenger

State: Michigan  Congressional District: 11
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
13 Carl Levin Democratic incumbent
16 Ronna Romney Republican challenger
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35 Morris Frumin Democratic challenger
34 Joe Knollenberg Republican incumbent

State: Michigan  Congressional District: 12
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
13 Carl Levin Democratic incumbent
16 Ronna Romney Republican challenger
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33 Sander Levin Democratic incumbent
36 John Pappageorge Republican challenger

State: Michigan  Congressional District: 14
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
13 Carl Levin Democratic incumbent
16 Ronna Romney Republican challenger
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33 John Conyers Jr. Democratic incumbent
36 William A. Ashe Republican challenger

State: Michigan  Congressional District: 15
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
13 Carl Levin Democratic incumbent
16 Ronna Romney Republican challenger
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
31 Carolyn Kilpatrick Democratic candidate
32 Stephen Hume Republican candidate
41 Barbara-Rose Collins Democrat -- retiring

State: Michigan  Congressional District: 16
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
13 Carl Levin Democratic incumbent
16 Ronna Romney Republican challenger
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33 John D. Dingell Democratic incumbent
36 James R. Desana Republican challenger
State: Minnesota  Congressional District: 1
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
13  Paul Wellstone  Democratic incumbent
16  Rudy Boschwitz  Republican challenger
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  Mary Rieder  Democratic challenger
34  Gil Gutknecht  Republican incumbent

State: Minnesota  Congressional District: 2
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
13  Paul Wellstone  Democratic incumbent
16  Rudy Boschwitz  Republican challenger
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  David Minge  Democratic incumbent
36  Gary B. Revier  Republican challenger

State: Minnesota  Congressional District: 4
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
13  Paul Wellstone  Democratic incumbent
16  Rudy Boschwitz  Republican challenger
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  Bruce F. Vento  Democratic incumbent
36  Dennis Newinski  Republican challenger

State: Minnesota  Congressional District: 5
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
13  Paul Wellstone  Democratic incumbent
16  Rudy Boschwitz  Republican challenger
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  Martin Olav Sabo  Democratic incumbent
36  Jack Uldrich  Republican challenger

State: Minnesota  Congressional District: 6
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
13  Paul Wellstone  Democratic incumbent
16  Rudy Boschwitz  Republican challenger
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  William F. Luther  Democratic incumbent
36  Tad Jude  Republican challenger

State: Mississippi  Congressional District: 3
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
15  James W. (Bootie) Hunt  Democratic challenger
14  Thad Cochran  Republican incumbent
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
31  John Arthur Eaves Jr.  Democratic candidate
32  Charles W. Pickering Jr  Republican candidate
41  G.V. Sonny Montgomery  Democrat -- retiring

State: Missouri  Congressional District: 1
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  William L. Clay  Democratic incumbent
36  Daniel O'Sullivan Jr.  Republican challenger

State: Missouri  Congressional District: 2
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  Joan Kelly Horn  Democratic challenger
34  James M. Talent  Republican incumbent
Page 240
State: Missouri  Congressional District: 3
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  Richard A. Gephardt  Democratic incumbent
36  Deborah Lynn Wheelehan  Republican challenger

State: Missouri  Congressional District: 4
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  Ike Skelton  Democratic incumbent
36  Bill Phelps  Republican challenger

State: Missouri  Congressional District: 5
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  Karen McCarthy  Democratic incumbent
36  Allen Hutchinson  Republican challenger

State: Missouri  Congressional District: 6
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  Pat Danner  Democratic incumbent
36  Jeff Bailey  Republican challenger

State: Missouri  Congressional District: 7
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
31  Ruth Bamberger  Democratic candidate
32  Roy Blunt  Republican candidate
42  Mel Hancock  Republican -- retiring

State: Missouri  Congressional District: 9
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  Harold L. Volkmer  Democratic incumbent
36  Kenny Hulshof  Republican challenger

State: Nebraska  Congressional District: 1
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
11  Ben Nelson  Democratic candidate
12  Chuck Hagel  Republican candidate
21  James Exon  Democrat -- retiring
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  Patrick J. Combs  Democratic challenger
34  Doug Bereuter  Republican incumbent

State: Nebraska  Congressional District: 2
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
11  Ben Nelson  Democratic candidate
12  Chuck Hagel  Republican candidate
21  James Exon  Democrat -- retiring
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  James Martin Davis  Democratic challenger
34  Jon Christensen  Republican incumbent

State: Nevada  Congressional District: 1
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  Bob Coffin  Democratic challenger
34  John Eric Ensign  Republican incumbent

State: New Hampshire  Congressional District: 1
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
15  Dick Swett  Democratic challenger
14  Robert C. Smith  Republican incumbent
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State: New Hampshire</th>
<th>Congressional District: 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31      Joe Keefe               Democratic candidate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32      John E. Sununu          Republican candidate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42      Bill Zeliff             Republican -- retiring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State: New Jersey</th>
<th>Congressional District: 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) Names for U.S. Senate:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15      Dick Swett              Democratic challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14      Robert C. Smith         Republican incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35      Deborah (Arnie) Arensen Democratic challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34      Charles Bass             Republican incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State: New Jersey</th>
<th>Congressional District: 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) Names for U.S. Senate:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11      Robert G. Torricelli Democratic candidate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12      Dick Zimmer              Republican candidate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21      Bill Bradley            Democrat -- retiring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35      Ruth Katz               Democratic challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36      Sophia A. Nelson         Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State: New Jersey</th>
<th>Congressional District: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) Names for U.S. Senate:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11      Robert G. Torricelli Democratic candidate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12      Dick Zimmer              Republican candidate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21      Bill Bradley            Democrat -- retiring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35      Larry Lerner            Democratic challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34      Bob Franks               Republican incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State: New Jersey</th>
<th>Congressional District: 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) Names for U.S. Senate:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11      Robert G. Torricelli Democratic candidate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12      Dick Zimmer              Republican candidate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21      Bill Bradley            Democrat -- retiring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31      Steven R. Rothman        Democratic candidate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32      Kathleen A. Donovan      Republican candidate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41      Robert G. Torricelli     Democrat -- retiring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State: New Jersey</th>
<th>Congressional District: 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) Names for U.S. Senate:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11      Robert G. Torricelli Democratic candidate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12      Dick Zimmer              Republican candidate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21      Bill Bradley            Democrat -- retiring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33      Donald M. Payne          Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36      Vanessa Williams         Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
State: New Jersey  Congressional District: 11
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
11  Robert G. Torricelli  Democratic candidate
12  Dick Zimmer  Republican candidate
21  Bill Bradley  Democrat -- retiring
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  Chris Evangel  Democratic challenger
34  Rodney Frelinghuysen  Republican incumbent

State: New Jersey  Congressional District: 12
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
11  Robert G. Torricelli  Democratic candidate
12  Dick Zimmer  Republican candidate
21  Bill Bradley  Democrat -- retiring
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
31  David N. Del Vecchio  Democratic candidate
32  Mike Pappas  Republican candidate
42  Dick Zimmer  Republican -- retiring

State: New Jersey  Congressional District: 13
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
11  Robert G. Torricelli  Democratic candidate
12  Dick Zimmer  Republican candidate
21  Bill Bradley  Democrat -- retiring
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  Robert Menendez  Democratic incumbent
36  Carlos E. Munoz  Republican challenger

State: New Mexico  Congressional District: 3
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
15  Art Trujillo  Democratic challenger
14  Pete V. Domenici  Republican incumbent
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  Bill Richardson  Democratic incumbent
36  Bill Redmond  Republican challenger

State: New York  Congressional District: 1
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  Nora Bredes  Democratic challenger
34  Michael P. Forbes  Republican incumbent

State: New York  Congressional District: 2
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  Kenneth J. Herman  Democratic challenger
34  Rick A. Lazio  Republican incumbent

State: New York  Congressional District: 4
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  Carolyn McCarthy  Democratic challenger
34  Daniel Frisa  Republican incumbent

State: New York  Congressional District: 6
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  Floyd H. Flake  Democratic incumbent
36  Jorawar Misir  Republican challenger

State: New York  Congressional District: 7
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  Thomas J. Manton  Democratic incumbent
36  Rose Birtley  Republican challenger

State: New York  Congressional District: 8
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  Jerrold Nadler  Democratic incumbent
36  Michael Benjamin  Republican challenger

State: New York  Congressional District: 10
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  Edolphus Towns  Democratic incumbent
36  Amelia Smith Parker  Republican challenger

State: New York  Congressional District: 11
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  Major R. Owens  Democratic incumbent
36  Claudette Hayle  Republican challenger

State: New York  Congressional District: 12
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  Nydia M. Velazquez  Democratic incumbent
36  Miguel I. Prado  Republican challenger

State: New York  Congressional District: 13
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  Tyrone G. Butler  Democratic challenger
34  Susan Molinari  Republican incumbent

State: New York  Congressional District: 14
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  Carolyn B. Maloney  Democratic incumbent
36  Jeffrey E. Livingston  Republican challenger

State: New York  Congressional District: 16
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  Jose E. Serrano  Democratic incumbent
36  Rodney Torres  Republican challenger

State: New York  Congressional District: 17
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  Eliot L. Engel  Democratic incumbent
36  Denis McCarthy  Republican challenger

State: New York  Congressional District: 18
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  Nita M. Lowey  Democratic incumbent
36  Kerry J. Katsorhis  Republican challenger

State: New York  Congressional District: 19
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  Richard S. Klein  Democratic challenger
34  Sue W. Kelly  Republican incumbent

State: New York  Congressional District: 25
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  Marty Mack  Democratic challenger
34  James T. Walsh  Republican incumbent

State: New York  Congressional District: 27
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
State: New York  Congressional District: 29
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33      John J. LaFalce       Democratic incumbent
36      David B. Callard      Republican challenger

State: New York  Congressional District: 30
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35      Francis Pordum        Democratic challenger
34      Jack Quinn            Republican incumbent

State: New York  Congressional District: 31
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35      Bruce D. MacBain      Democratic challenger
34      Amo Houghton          Republican incumbent

State: North Carolina  Congressional District: 2
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
15      Harvey B. Gantt       Democratic challenger
14      Jesse Helms           Republican incumbent
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35      Bob Etheridge         Democratic challenger
34      David Funderburk      Republican incumbent

State: North Carolina  Congressional District: 4
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
15      Harvey B. Gantt       Democratic challenger
14      Jesse Helms           Republican incumbent
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35      David E. Price        Democratic challenger
34      Fred Heineman         Republican incumbent

State: North Carolina  Congressional District: 7
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
15      Harvey B. Gantt       Democratic challenger
14      Jesse Helms           Republican incumbent
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
31      Mike McIntyre         Democratic candidate
32      Bill Caster          Republican candidate
41      Charile Rose         Democrat -- retiring

State: North Carolina  Congressional District: 8
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
15      Harvey B. Gantt       Democratic challenger
14      Jesse Helms           Republican incumbent
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33      W.G. (Bill) Hefner    Democratic incumbent
36      Curtis Blackwood     Republican challenger

State: Ohio  Congressional District: 2
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35      Thomas R. Chandler   Democratic challenger
34      Rob Portman          Republican incumbent

State: Ohio  Congressional District: 3
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33      Tony P. Hall         Democratic incumbent
State: Ohio
Congressional District: 7
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35 Richard K. Blain Democratic challenger
34 David L. Hobson Republican incumbent

State: Ohio
Congressional District: 8
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35 Jeffrey D. Kitchen Democratic challenger
34 John A. Boehner Republican incumbent

State: Ohio
Congressional District: 10
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35 Dennis J. Kucinich Democratic challenger
34 Martin R. Hoke Republican incumbent

State: Ohio
Congressional District: 17
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33 James A. Traficant Democratic incumbent
36 Thomas P. McCabe Republican challenger

State: Ohio
Congressional District: 18
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35 Robert L. Burch Democratic challenger
34 Bob Ney Republican incumbent

State: Ohio
Congressional District: 19
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35 Thomas J. Coyne Jr. Democratic challenger
34 Martin R. Hoke Republican incumbent

State: Oklahoma
Congressional District: 1
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
15 Jim Boren Democratic challenger
14 James M. Inhofe Republican incumbent
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35 Randolph Amen Democratic challenger
34 Steve Largent Republican incumbent

State: Oklahoma
Congressional District: 2
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
15 Jim Boren Democratic challenger
14 James M. Inhofe Republican incumbent
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33 Glen D. Johnson Democratic incumbent
36 Tom Coburn Republican challenger

State: Oklahoma
Congressional District: 4
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
15 Jim Boren Democratic challenger
14 James M. Inhofe Republican incumbent
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35 Ed Crocker Democratic challenger
34 J.C. Watts Republican incumbent

State: Oregon
Congressional District: 2
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
11      Tom Bruggere            Democratic candidate
12      Gordon Smith            Republican candidate
22      Mark Hatfield           Republican -- retiring
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35      Mike Dugan              Democratic challenger
34      Wes Cooley              Republican incumbent

State: Oregon               Congressional District: 4
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
11      Tom Bruggere            Democratic candidate
12      Gordon Smith            Republican candidate
22      Mark Hatfield           Republican -- retiring
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33      Peter A. DeFazio        Democratic incumbent
36      John D. Newkirk         Republican challenger

State: Pennsylvania        Congressional District: 1
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33      Thomas M. Foglietta     Democratic incumbent
36      James D. Cella          Republican challenger

State: Pennsylvania        Congressional District: 2
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33      Chaka Fattah            Democratic incumbent
36      Larry G. Murphy         Republican challenger

State: Pennsylvania        Congressional District: 5
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
31      Ruth C. Rudy            Democratic candidate
32      John E. Peterson        Republican candidate
42      William F. Clinger Jr.  Republican -- retiring

State: Pennsylvania        Congressional District: 7
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35      John Innelli            Democratic challenger
34      Curt Weldon             Republican incumbent

State: Pennsylvania        Congressional District: 8
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35      John P. Murray          Democratic challenger
34      James C. Greenwood      Republican incumbent

State: Pennsylvania        Congressional District: 11
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33      Paul E. Kanjorski       Democratic incumbent
36      Stephen A. Urban        Republican challenger

State: Pennsylvania        Congressional District: 12
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33      John P. Murtha          Democratic incumbent
36      Bill Choby              Republican challenger

State: Pennsylvania        Congressional District: 13
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35      Joseph M. Hoeffel       Democratic challenger
34      Jon D. Fox              Republican incumbent

State: Pennsylvania        Congressional District: 14
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
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State: Pennsylvania  Congressional District: 17
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  Paul Kettl  Democratic challenger
34  George W. Gekas  Republican incumbent

State: Pennsylvania  Congressional District: 18
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  Mike Doyle  Democratic incumbent
36  David B. Fawcett  Republican challenger

State: South Carolina  Congressional District: 2
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
15  Elliot Springs Close  Democratic challenger
14  Strom Thurmond  Republican incumbent
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
34  Floyd D. Spence  Republican incumbent

State: South Dakota  Congressional District: 1
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
15  Tim Johnson  Democratic challenger
14  Larry Pressler  Republican incumbent
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
31  Rick Weiland  Democratic candidate
32  John R. Thune  Republican candidate
41  Tim Johnson  Democrat -- retiring

State: Tennessee  Congressional District: 2
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
15  J. Houston Gordon  Democratic challenger
14  Fred Thompson  Republican incumbent
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  Stephen Smith  Democratic challenger
34  John J. Duncan Jr.  Republican incumbent

State: Tennessee  Congressional District: 3
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
15  J. Houston Gordon  Democratic challenger
14  Fred Thompson  Republican incumbent
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  Charles (Chuck) Jolly  Democratic challenger
34  Zach Wamp  Republican incumbent

State: Tennessee  Congressional District: 4
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
15  J. Houston Gordon  Democratic challenger
14  Fred Thompson  Republican incumbent
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  Mark Stewart  Democratic challenger
34  William Van Hilleary  Republican incumbent

State: Tennessee  Congressional District: 5
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
15  J. Houston Gordon  Democratic challenger
14  Fred Thompson  Republican incumbent
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  Bob Clement  Democratic incumbent
State: Texas  Congressional District: 2
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
15  Victor M. Morales  Democratic challenger
14  Phil Gramm  Republican incumbent
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
31  Jim Turner  Democratic candidate
32  Brian Babin  Republican candidate
41  Charles Wilson  Democrat -- retiring

State: Texas  Congressional District: 3
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
15  Victor M. Morales  Democratic challenger
14  Phil Gramm  Republican incumbent
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  Lee Cole  Democratic challenger
34  Sam Johnson  Republican incumbent

State: Texas  Congressional District: 6
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
15  Victor M. Morales  Democratic challenger
14  Phil Gramm  Republican incumbent
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  Janet Carroll Richardson  Democratic challenger
34  Joe L. Barton  Republican incumbent

State: Texas  Congressional District: 7
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
15  Victor M. Morales  Democratic challenger
14  Phil Gramm  Republican incumbent
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  Al Siegmund  Democratic challenger
34  Bill Archer  Republican incumbent

State: Texas  Congressional District: 8
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
15  Victor M. Morales  Democratic challenger
14  Phil Gramm  Republican incumbent
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
31  C.J. Newman  Democratic candidate
32  Kevin Brady  Republican candidate
42  Jack Fields Jr.  Republican -- retiring

State: Texas  Congressional District: 9
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
15  Victor M. Morales  Democratic challenger
14  Phil Gramm  Republican incumbent
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  Nick Lampson  Democratic challenger
34  Steve Stockman  Republican incumbent

State: Texas  Congressional District: 11
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
15  Victor M. Morales  Democratic challenger
14  Phil Gramm  Republican incumbent
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  Chet Edwards  Democratic incumbent
36  Jay Mathis  Republican challenger
State: Texas    Congressional District: 12
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
15  Victor M. Morales  Democratic challenger
14  Phil Gramm  Republican incumbent
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
31  Hugh Parmer  Democratic candidate
32  Kay Granger  Republican candidate
41  Pete Green  Democrat -- retiring

State: Texas    Congressional District: 13
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
15  Victor M. Morales  Democratic challenger
14  Phil Gramm  Republican incumbent
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  Samuel Brown Silverman  Democratic challenger
34  William (Mac) Thornberry  Republican incumbent

State: Texas    Congressional District: 14
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
15  Victor M. Morales  Democratic challenger
14  Phil Gramm  Republican incumbent
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
31  Charles 'Lefty' Morris  Democratic candidate
32  Ron Paul  Republican candidate
42  Greg Laughlin  Republican -- retiring

State: Texas    Congressional District: 15
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
15  Victor M. Morales  Democratic challenger
14  Phil Gramm  Republican incumbent
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
31  Ruben Hinojosa  Democratic candidate
32  Tom Haughey  Republican candidate
41  E (Kika) de la Garza  Democrat -- retiring

State: Texas    Congressional District: 18
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
15  Victor M. Morales  Democratic challenger
14  Phil Gramm  Republican incumbent
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  Sheila Jackson Lee  Democratic incumbent
36  Larry White  Republican challenger

State: Texas    Congressional District: 21
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
15  Victor M. Morales  Democratic challenger
14  Phil Gramm  Republican incumbent
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  Gordon H. Wharton  Democratic challenger
34  Lamar Smith  Republican incumbent

State: Texas    Congressional District: 22
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
15  Victor M. Morales  Democratic challenger
14  Phil Gramm  Republican incumbent
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  Scott Douglas Cunningham  Democratic challenger
34  Tom DeLay  Republican incumbent
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State: Texas  Congressional District: 25  
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:  
15 Victor M. Morales  Democratic challenger  
14 Phil Gramm  Republican incumbent  
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:  
33 Ken Bentsen  Democratic incumbent  
36 Brent Perry  Republican challenger  

State: Texas  Congressional District: 26  
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:  
15 Victor M. Morales  Democratic challenger  
14 Phil Gramm  Republican incumbent  
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:  
35 Jerry Frankel  Democratic challenger  
34 Dick Armey  Republican incumbent  

State: Texas  Congressional District: 28  
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:  
15 Victor M. Morales  Democratic challenger  
14 Phil Gramm  Republican incumbent  
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:  
33 Frank Tejeda  Democratic incumbent  
36 Mark Lynn Cude  Republican challenger  

State: Texas  Congressional District: 29  
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:  
15 Victor M. Morales  Democratic challenger  
14 Phil Gramm  Republican incumbent  
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:  
33 Gene Green  Democratic incumbent  
36 Jack Rodriguez  Republican challenger  

State: Utah  Congressional District: 1  
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:  
35 Gregory J. Sanders  Democratic challenger  
34 James V. Hansen  Republican incumbent  

State: Utah  Congressional District: 2  
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:  
31 Ross C. Anderson  Democratic candidate  
32 Merrill Cook  Republican candidate  
42 Enid Greene  Republican -- retiring  

State: Utah  Congressional District: 3  
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:  
33 Bill Orton  Democratic incumbent  
36 Christopher B. Cannon  Republican challenger  

State: Virginia  Congressional District: 1  
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:  
15 Mark Warner  Democratic challenger  
14 John W. Warner  Republican incumbent  
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:  
35 Russell Axsom  Democratic challenger  
34 Herbert H. Bateman  Republican incumbent  

State: Virginia  Congressional District: 2  
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State: Virginia</th>
<th>Congressional District: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) Names for U.S. Senate:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15  Mark Warner          Democratic challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14  John W. Warner        Republican incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33  Owen B. Pickett       Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36  John Tate             Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State: Virginia</th>
<th>Congressional District: 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) Names for U.S. Senate:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15  Mark Warner          Democratic challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14  John W. Warner        Republican incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33  Robert C. Scott       Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36  Elsie Holland         Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State: Virginia</th>
<th>Congressional District: 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) Names for U.S. Senate:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15  Mark Warner          Democratic challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14  John W. Warner        Republican incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31  Virgil Goode          Democratic candidate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32  George C. Landrith III Republican candidate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41  Lewis F. Payne        Democrat -- retiring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State: Virginia</th>
<th>Congressional District: 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) Names for U.S. Senate:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15  Mark Warner          Democratic challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14  John W. Warner        Republican incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35  Jeffrey Grey          Democratic challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34  Robert W. Goodlatte   Republican incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State: Virginia</th>
<th>Congressional District: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) Names for U.S. Senate:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15  Mark Warner          Democratic challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14  John W. Warner        Republican incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35  Roderic H. Slayton    Democratic challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34  Thomas J. Bliley Jr.  Republican incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State: Virginia</th>
<th>Congressional District: 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) Names for U.S. Senate:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15  Mark Warner          Democratic challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14  John W. Warner        Republican incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33  James P. Moran        Democratic incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36  John Otey             Republican challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State: Virginia</th>
<th>Congressional District: 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) Names for U.S. Senate:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15  Mark Warner          Democratic challenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14  John W. Warner        Republican incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33      Rick Boucher            Democratic incumbent
36      Patrick Muldoon         Republican challenger
-----------------------------------------------------
State: Virginia        Congressional District: 10
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
15      Mark Warner             Democratic challenger
14      John W. Warner          Republican incumbent
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35      Robert L. Weinberg      Democratic challenger
34      Frank R. Wolf           Republican incumbent
-----------------------------------------------------
State: Virginia        Congressional District: 11
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
15      Mark Warner             Democratic challenger
14      John W. Warner          Republican incumbent
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35      Tom Horton              Democratic challenger
34      Thomas M. Davis III     Republican incumbent
-----------------------------------------------------
State: Washington      Congressional District: 1
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35      Jeff Coopersmith        Democratic challenger
34      Rick White              Republican incumbent
-----------------------------------------------------
State: Washington      Congressional District: 2
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35      Kevin Quigley           Democratic challenger
34      Jack Metcalf            Republican incumbent
-----------------------------------------------------
State: Washington      Congressional District: 6
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33      Norm Dicks              Democratic incumbent
36      Bill Tinsley            Republican challenger
-----------------------------------------------------
State: Washington      Congressional District: 7
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33      Jim McDermott           Democratic incumbent
36      Frank Kleschen          Republican challenger
-----------------------------------------------------
State: Washington      Congressional District: 8
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35      Dave Little             Democratic challenger
34      Jennifer Dunn           Republican incumbent
-----------------------------------------------------
State: Washington      Congressional District: 9
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35      Adam Smith              Democratic challenger
34      Randy Tate              Republican incumbent
-----------------------------------------------------
State: West Virginia   Congressional District: 1
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
13      Jay Rockefeller         Democratic incumbent
16      Betty A. Burks           Republican challenger
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33      Alan B. Mollohan         Democratic incumbent
-----------------------------------------------------
State: West Virginia   Congressional District: 3
(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
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State: Wisconsin
Congressional District: 2
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  Paul R. Soglin  Democratic challenger
34  Scott L. Klug  Republican incumbent

State: Wisconsin
Congressional District: 4
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  Gerald D. Kleczka  Democratic incumbent
36  Tom Reynolds  Republican challenger

State: Wisconsin
Congressional District: 5
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
33  Thomas M. Barrett  Democratic incumbent
36  Paul D. Melotik  Republican challenger

State: Wisconsin
Congressional District: 9
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  Floyd Brenholt  Democratic challenger
34  F. James Sensenbrenner  Republican incumbent

State: Wyoming
Congressional District: 1
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35  Pete Maxfield  Democratic challenger
34  Barbara L. Cubin  Republican incumbent

BALLOT CARD

For the November 1996 General Election
======================================
State: New Jersey
Congressional District: 01
Democratic  Republican
Party  Party
----------
Robert E. Andrews  Sophia A. Nelson

CANDIDATES FOR THE
U.S. HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES:
Robert G. Torricelli  Dick Zimmer

BALLOT CARD
For the November 1996 General Election
======================================
State: Kansas
Congressional District: 01
Democratic  Republican
Party  Party
----------
CANDIDATES FOR THE
U.S. HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES:

CANDIDATES FOR THE
U.S. SENATE:

BALLOT CARD

For the November 1996 General Election

State: New York
Congressional District: 01
Democratic
Republican
---
---

CANDIDATES FOR THE
U.S. HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES:

>> MASTER CODE
CANDIDATE SUPPORT

REPUBLICAN:

Presidential:
01 Incumbent Presidential candidate, Republican
03 Nonincumbent Presidential candidate, Republican

Senate:
12 US Senate candidate, Republican, in race w/o incumbent
14 US Senate incumbent candidate, Republican
16 US Senate challenger candidate, Republican
18 US Senator, Republican, no race in state +++
22 Retiring US Senator, Republican +++
28 US Senator, Republican, no race in state +++
29 US Senator, Republican, term not up in state w/race +++

House:
32 US House candidate, Republican, in race w/o incumbent
34 US House incumbent candidate, Republican
36 US House challenger candidate, Republican
42 Retiring US House Representative, Republican +++

Governor:
52 Gubernatorial candidate, Republican, in race w/o incumbent
54 Gubernatorial incumbent candidate, Republican
56 Gubernatorial challenger candidate, Republican
58 Governor, Republican, no race in state +++
62 Retiring governor, Republican +++

Miscellaneous:
72 NA which candidate(s), Republican
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74 Other candidate not listed above, Republican
76 Republican party

DEMOCRATIC:

Presidential:
02 Incumbent Presidential candidate, Democratic
04 Nonincumbent Presidential candidate, Democratic

Senate:
11 US Senate candidate, Democratic, in race w/o incumbent
13 US Senate incumbent candidate, Democratic
15 US Senate challenger candidate, Democratic
17 US Senator, Democratic, no race in state +++
19 US Senator, Democratic, term not up in state w/race +++
21 Retiring US Senator, Democratic +++
27 US Senator, Democratic, no race in state +++

House:
31 US House candidate, Democratic, in race w/o incumbent
33 US House incumbent candidate, Democratic
35 US House challenger candidate, Democratic
41 Retiring US House Representative, Democratic +++

Governor:
51 Gubernatorial candidate, Democratic, in race w/o incumbent
53 Gubernatorial incumbent candidate, Democratic
55 Gubernatorial challenger candidate, Democratic
57 Governor, Democratic, no race in state +++
61 Retiring Governor, Democratic +++

Miscellaneous:
71 NA which candidate(s), Democratic
73 Other candidate not listed above, Democratic
75 Democratic party

OTHER:
05 Presidential candidate, independent
10 Independent or 3rd party Senate candidate ***
30 Independent or 3rd party House candidate ***
50 Independent or 3rd party Gubernatorial candidate ***
80 Other minor party or minor independent candidate--any office level
85 3rd/other party
95 Other candidate(s) for state/local offices (office given but party NA), or non-party candidate
96 Other groups/individuals which are neither parties nor organized supporters of specific cands
97 Candidate name given but office and party NA
98 DK
99 NA

+++ NAMES USED ONLY IN ERROR BY R
1. "METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS (MSA's):"

The general concept of a metropolitan area is one of a large population nucleus, together with adjacent communities that have a high degree of economic and social integration with that nucleus.

In 1990 the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the U.S. Census have used the term Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) for what in 1980 was referred to as Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA). An attempt has been made by the study staff to be consistent in using the newer terms in the current documentation and definitions. The definitions of characteristics to be classified as a metropolitan area have remained fairly consistent—with only minor changes between 1980 and 1990. However, due to changes in population size and density, employment, commuting and other behavior which defines metropolitan areas, the specific geographical composition of any given metropolitan area has, of course, frequently changed. The specific MSA title may also have changed as to which cities are named and in what order.

Each MSA has one or more central counties containing the area's main population concentration: an urbanized area with at least 50,000 inhabitants. An MSA may also include outlying counties that have close economic and social relationships with the central counties. The outlying counties must have a specified level of commuting to the central counties and must also meet certain standards regarding metropolitan character, such as population density, urban population and population growth. In New England, MSA's are composed of cities and towns rather than whole counties.

The population living in MSA's may also be referred to as the metropolitan population. The population is subdivided into "inside central city (or cities)" and "outside central city (or cities)." (The population living outside MSA's constitutes the non-metropolitan population.) Most MSA's have one to three CENTRAL CITIES that are named in the census title of the MSA.
2. "CONSOLIDATED METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS (CMSA's):"

In some parts of the country, metropolitan development has progressed to the point that adjoining MSA's are themselves socially and economically interrelated. These areas are designated consolidated metropolitan statistical areas (CMSA's) by the Office of Management and Budget, and are defined using standards included as part of the new MSA standards described above. MSA's that are a part of a CMSA are referred to as primary metropolitan statistical areas (PMSA's).

Definitions of the six largest CMSA's:

NEW YORK-NORTHERN NEW JERSEY-LONG ISLAND, NY-NJ-CT, CMSA
Bergen-Passaic, NJ PMSA
Bridgeport-Milford, CT PMSA
Danbury, CT PMSA
Jersey City, NJ PMSA
Middlesex-Somerset-Hunterdon, NJ PMSA
Monmouth-Ocean NJ PMSA
Nassau-Suffolk, NY PMSA*
New York, NY PMSA*
Newark, NJ PMSA*
Norwalk, CT PMSA
Orange County, NY PMSA
Stamford, CT PMSA

LOS ANGELES-ANAHEIM-RIVERSIDE, CA, CMSA
Anaheim-Santa Ana, CA PMSA*
Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA PMSA*
Oxnard-Ventura, CA PMSA
Riverside-San Bernardino, CA PMSA*

CHICAGO-GARY-LAKE COUNTY (IL), IL-IN-WI CMSA
Aurora-Elgin, IL PMSA* (Kane Co part only)
Chicago, IL PMSA*
Gary-Hammond, IN PMSA
Joliet, IL PMSA* (Will Co part only)
Kenosha, WI PMSA
Lake County, IL PMSA*

SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND-SAN JOSE, CA, CMSA
Oakland, CA PMSA*
San Francisco, CA PMSA*
San Jose, CA PMSA
Santa Cruz, CA PMSA
Santa Rosa-Petaluma, CA PMSA
Vallejo-Fairfield-Napa, CA PMSA

PHILADELPHIA-WILMINGTON-TRENTON, PA-NJ-DE-MD, CMSA
Philadelphia, PA-NJ, PMSA*
Trenton, NJ PMSA
Vineland-Millville-Bridgeton, NJ PMSA
Wilmington, DE-NJ-MD PMSA

DETROIT-ANN ARBOR, MI, CMSA
Ann Arbor, MI PMSA
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For the purpose of size and distance coding of suburbs and non-MSAs, the central cities of the six largest CMSAs are listed as:

1. New York City (Bronx, Brooklyn, Manhattan, Queens), NY, Elizabeth, NJ and Newark, NJ

2. Los Angeles, Long Beach, Pasadena, Pomona, Burbank, Anaheim, Santa Ana, Riverside, San Bernardino and Palm Springs, CA.

3. Chicago, Evanston and Chicago Heights, Aurora, Elgin, Joliet, Waukegan and North Chicago, IL

4. San Francisco, Oakland, Berkeley and Livermore, CA

5. Philadelphia and Norristown, PA and Camden, NJ

6. Detroit, Dearborn, Pontiac and Port Huron, MI

Both the CMSA definitions and the central city designations above are from Metropolitan Statistical Areas, 1990, U.S. Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC (Jun 1990) (PB90-214420)

3. "URBANIZED AREAS:"

The major objective of the Census Bureau in delineating urbanized areas is to provide a better separation of urban and rural population in the vicinity of large cities. An urbanized area consists of a central city or cities, and surrounding closely settled territory ("urban fringe").

4. "PLACES:"

Two types of places are recognized in the census reports--incorporated places and unincorporated places, defined as follows:

5. "INCORPORATED PLACES:"

These are political units incorporated as cities, boroughs, towns and villages with the following exceptions: (a) boroughs in Alaska; and (b) towns in New York, Wisconsin and the New England states.

6. "UNINCORPORATED PLACES:"

The Census Bureau has delineated boundaries for closely settled population centers without corporate limits. Each place so delineated possesses a definite nucleus of residences and has its boundaries drawn to include, if feasible, all the surrounding closely settled area. These are called Census Designated Places (CDP's).
The full 3-digit 1980 Census Occupation Code was used to code the occupation of respondents. In order to minimize the amount of highly specific information released about respondents, the full occupation code has been recoded to a 71 category code, which is based on the occupation code sub-headings in the Census Code.

Users who need access to the full 3-digit occupation code for their research purposes should contact NES project staff for details about how this could be arranged.

In the code description that follows, the full 1980 Census Code is presented. At the beginning of each recoded section, the statement "(XXX) THROUGH (YYY) ARE RECODED TO (ZZ)" indicates the code values to which the specific occupations have been recoded. For example, purchasing managers (009), legislators (003), and funeral directors (018) have all been recoded to (01). Numbers in parentheses following the occupation categories are the U.S. Department of Commerce's 1980 Standard Occupational Classification code equivalents. The abbreviation "pt" means "part" and "N.E.C." means "not elsewhere classified".

MANAGERIAL AND PROFESSIONAL SPECIALTY OCCUPATIONS

Executive, Administrative, and Managerial

(003) THROUGH (019) ARE RECODED TO: 01

003 LEGISLATORS (111)
004 CHIEF EXECUTIVES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATORS, PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION (112)
005 ADMINISTRATORS AND OFFICIALS, PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION (1132-1139)
006 ADMINISTRATORS, PROTECTIVE SERVICES (1131)
007 FINANCIAL MANAGERS (122)
008 PERSONNEL AND LABOR RELATIONS MANAGERS (123)
009 PURCHASING MANAGERS (124)
013 MANAGERS, MARKETING, ADVERTISING, AND PUBLIC RELATIONS (125)
014 ADMINISTRATORS, EDUCATION AND RELATED FIELDS (128)
015 MANAGERS, MEDICINE AND HEALTH (131)
016 MANAGERS, PROPERTIES AND REAL ESTATE (1353)
017 POSTMASTERS AND MAIL SUPERINTENDENTS (1344)
018 FUNERAL DIRECTORS (PT 1359)
019 MANAGERS AND ADMINISTRATORS, N.E.C. (121, 126, 127, 132-139, EXCEPT 1344, 1353, PT 1359)

Management-Related Occupations

(023) THROUGH (037) ARE RECODED TO: 02

023 ACCOUNTANTS AND AUDITORS (1412)
024 UNDERWRITERS (1414)
Professional Specialty Occupations

- engineers, architects and surveyors -

(043) THROUGH (063) ARE RECODED TO: 03

043 ARCHITECTS (161)
ENGINES

044 AEROSPACE ENGINEERS (1622)
045 METALLURGICAL AND MATERIALS ENGINEERS (1623)
046 MINING ENGINEERS (1624)
047 PETROLEUM ENGINEERS (1625)
048 CHEMICAL ENGINEERS (1626)
049 NUCLEAR ENGINEERS (1627)
053 CIVIL ENGINEERS (1628)
054 AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERS (1632)
055 ELECTRICAL AND ELECTRONIC ENGINEERS (1633, 1636)
056 INDUSTRIAL ENGINEERS (1634)
057 MECHANICAL ENGINEERS (1635)
058 MARINE ENGINEERS AND NAVAL ARCHITECTS (1637)
059 ENGINEERS, N.E.C. (1639)
063 SURVEYORS AND MAPPING SCIENTISTS (164)

- mathematical and computer scientists -

(064) THROUGH (068) ARE RECODED TO: 04

064 COMPUTER SYSTEMS ANALYSTS AND SCIENTISTS (171)
065 OPERATIONS AND SYSTEMS RESEARCHERS AND ANALYSTS (172)
066 ACTUARIES (1732)
067 STATISTICIANS (1733)
068 MATHEMATICAL SCIENTISTS, N.E.C. (1739)

- natural scientists -

(069) THROUGH (083) ARE RECODED TO: 05

069 PHYSICISTS AND ASTRONOMERS (1842, 1843)
073 CHEMISTS, EXCEPT BIOCHEMISTS (1845)
ATMOSPHERIC AND SPACE SCIENTISTS (1846)
GEOLOGISTS AND GEODESISTS (1847)
PHYSICAL SCIENTISTS, N.E.C. (1849)
AGRICULTURAL AND FOOD SCIENTISTS (1853)
BIOLOGICAL AND LIFE SCIENTISTS (1854)
FORESTRY AND CONSERVATION SCIENTISTS (1852)
MEDICAL SCIENTISTS (1855)

- health diagnosing occupations -

(084) THROUGH (089) ARE RECODED TO: 06

PHYSICIANS (261)
DENTISTS (262)
VETERINARIANS (27)
OPTOMETRISTS (281)
PODIATRISTS (283)
HEALTH DIAGNOSING PRACTITIONERS, N.E.C. (289)

- health assessment and treating occupations -

(095) THROUGH (106) ARE RECODED TO: 07

REGISTERED NURSES (29)
PHARMACISTS (301)
DIETITIANS (302)

INHALATION THERAPISTS (3031)
OCCUPATIONAL THERAPISTS (3032)
PHYSICAL THERAPISTS (3033)
SPEECH THERAPISTS (3034)
THERAPISTS, N.E.C. (3039)
PHYSICIANS' ASSISTANTS (304)

- teachers, postsecondary -

(113) THROUGH (154) ARE RECODED TO: 08

EARTH, ENVIRONMENTAL AND MARINE SCIENCE TEACHERS (2212)
BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE TEACHERS (2213)
CHEMISTRY TEACHERS (2214)
PHYSICS TEACHERS (2215)
NATURAL SCIENCE TEACHERS, N.E.C. (2216)
PSYCHOLOGY TEACHERS (2217)
ECONOMICS TEACHERS (2218)
HISTORY TEACHERS (2222)
POLITICAL SCIENCE TEACHERS (2223)
SOCIOLOGY TEACHERS (2224)
SOCIAL SCIENCE TEACHERS, N.E.C. (2225)
ENGINEERING TEACHERS (2226)
MATHEMATICAL SCIENCE TEACHERS (2227)
COMPUTER SCIENCE TEACHERS (2228)
MEDICAL SCIENCE TEACHERS (2231)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>HEALTH SPECIALTIES TEACHERS (2232)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>BUSINESS, COMMERCE, AND MARKETING TEACHERS (2233)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY TEACHERS (2234)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>ART, DRAMA, AND MUSIC TEACHERS (2235)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHERS (2236)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>EDUCATION TEACHERS (2237)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>ENGLISH TEACHERS (2238)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHERS (2242)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>LAW TEACHERS (2243)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>SOCIAL WORK TEACHERS (2244)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>THEOLOGY TEACHERS (2245)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>TRADE AND INDUSTRIAL TEACHERS (2246)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS (2247)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>TEACHERS, POSTSECONDARY, N.E.C. (2249)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>POSTSECONDARY TEACHERS, SUBJECT NOT SPECIFIED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- teachers, except postsecondary -

(155) THROUGH (165) ARE RECODED TO: 09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>TEACHERS, PREKINDERGARTEN AND KINDERGARTEN (231)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>TEACHERS, ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (232)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>TEACHERS, SECONDARY SCHOOL (233)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>TEACHERS, SPECIAL EDUCATION (235)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>TEACHERS, N.E.C. (236,239)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>COUNSELORS, EDUCATIONAL AND VOCATIONAL (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>BIOLOGICAL TECHNICIANS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>CHEMICAL TECHNICIANS (3831)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>SCIENCE TECHNICIANS, N.E.C. (3832, 3833, 384, 389)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- technicians, except health, engineering, and science -

(226) THROUGH (235) ARE RECODED TO: 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>AIRPLANE PILOTS AND NAVIGATORS (825)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS (392)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>BROADCAST EQUIPMENT OPERATORS (393)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>COMPUTER PROGRAMMERS (3971, 3972)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>TOOL PROGRAMMERS, NUMERICAL CONTROL (3974)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>LEGAL ASSISTANTS (396)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>TECHNICIANS, N.E.C. (399)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SALES OCCUPATIONS

Supervisors and Proprietors

(243) IS RECODED TO: 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>SUPERVISORS AND PROPRIETORS, SALES OCCUPATIONS (40)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sales Representatives, Finance and Business Services

(253) THROUGH (257) ARE RECODED TO: 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>INSURANCE SALES OCCUPATIONS (4122)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
254    REAL ESTATE SALES OCCUPATIONS (4123)
255    SECURITIES AND FINANCIAL SERVICES SALES OCCUPATIONS (4124)
256    ADVERTISING AND RELATED SALES OCCUPATIONS (4153)
257    SALES OCCUPATIONS, OTHER BUSINESS SERVICES (4152)

------------------------------------------------------------
Sales Representatives, Commodities except Retail
(258) THROUGH (259) ARE RECODED TO: 19
258    SALES ENGINEERS (421)
259    SALES REPRESENTATIVES, MINING, MANUFACTURING, AND WHOLESALE (423, 424)

------------------------------------------------------------
Sales Workers, Retail and Personal Services
(263) THROUGH (278) ARE RECODED TO: 20
263    SALES WORKERS, MOTOR VEHICLES AND BOATS (4342, 4344)
264    SALES WORKERS, APPAREL (4346)
265    SALES WORKERS, SHOES (4351)
266    SALES WORKERS, FURNITURE AND HOME FURNISHINGS (4348)
267    SALES WORKERS; RADIO, TELEVISION, HI-FI, AND APPLIANCES (4343, 4352)
268    SALES WORKERS, HARDWARE AND BUILDING SUPPLIES (4353)
269    SALES WORKERS, PARTS (4367)
274    SALES WORKERS, OTHER COMMODITIES (4345, 4347, 4354, 4356, 4359, 4362, 4369)
275    SALES COUNTER CLERKS (4363)
276    CASHIERS (4364)
277    STREET AND DOOR-TO-DOOR SALES WORKERS (4366)
278    NEWS VENDORS (4365)

------------------------------------------------------------
Sales Related Occupations
(283) THROUGH (285) ARE RECODED TO: 21
283    DEMONSTRATORS, PROMOTERS AND MODELS, SALES (445)
284    AUCTIONEERS (447)
285    SALES SUPPORT OCCUPATIONS, N.E.C. (444, 446, 449)

------------------------------------------------------------
ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT, (incl. Clerical supervisors)

Clerical Supervisors
(303) THROUGH (307) ARE RECODED TO: 22
303    SUPERVISORS, GENERAL OFFICE (4511, 4513-4519, 4529)
304    SUPERVISORS, COMPUTER EQUIPMENT OPERATORS (4512)
305    SUPERVISORS, FINANCIAL RECORDS PROCESSING (4521)
306    CHIEF COMMUNICATIONS OPERATORS (4523)
307    SUPERVISORS; DISTRIBUTION, SCHEDULING, AND
Computer Equipment Operators

(308) THROUGH (309) ARE RECODED TO: 23

308  COMPUTER OPERATORS (4612)
309  PERIPHERAL EQUIPMENT OPERATORS (4613)

Secretaries, Stenographers, and Typists

(313) THROUGH (315) ARE RECODED TO: 24

313  SECRETARIES (4622)
314  STENOGRAPHERS (4623)
315  TYPISTS (4624)

Information Clerks

(316) THROUGH (323) ARE RECODED TO: 25

316  INTERVIEWERS (4642)
317  HOTEL CLERKS (4643)
318  TRANSPORTATION TICKET AND RESERVATION AGENTS (4644)
319  RECEPTIONISTS (4645)
323  INFORMATION CLERKS, N.E.C. (4649)

Records Processing Occupations, except Financial

(325) THROUGH (336) ARE RECODED TO: 26

325  CLASSIFIED-AD CLERKS (4662)
326  CORRESPONDENCE CLERKS (4663)
327  ORDER CLERKS (4664)
328  PERSONNEL CLERKS, EXCEPT PAYROLL AND TIMEKEEPING (4692)
329  LIBRARY CLERKS (4694)
335  FILE CLERKS (4696)
336  RECORDS CLERKS (4699)

Financial Records Processing Occupations

(337) THROUGH (344) ARE RECODED TO: 27

337  BOOKKEEPERS, ACCOUNTING, AND AUDITING CLERKS (4712)
338  PAYROLL AND TIMEKEEPING CLERKS (4713)
339  BILLING CLERKS (4715)
343  COST AND RATE CLERKS (4716)
344  BILLING, POSTING, AND CALCULATING MACHINE OPERATORS (4718)

Duplicating, Mail and Other Office Machine Operators
(345) THROUGH (347) ARE RECODED TO: 28
345 DUPLICATING MACHINE OPERATORS (4722)
346 MAIL PREPARING AND PAPER HANDLING MACHINE OPERATORS (4739)
347 OFFICE MACHINE OPERATORS, N.E.C. (4729)

Communications Equipment Operators

(348) THROUGH (353) ARE RECODED TO: 29
348 TELEPHONE OPERATORS (4732)
349 TELEGRAPHERS (4733)
353 COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT OPERATORS, N.E.C. (4739)

Mail and Message Distributing Occupations

(354) THROUGH (357) ARE RECODED TO: 30
354 POSTAL CLERKS, EXC. MAIL CARRIERS (4742)
355 MAIL CARRIERS, POSTAL SERVICE (4743)
356 MAIL CLERKS, EXC. POSTAL SERVICE (4744)
357 MESSENGERS (4745)

Material Recording, Scheduling, and Distributing Clerks, N.E.C.

(359) THROUGH (374) ARE RECODED TO: 31
359 DISPATCHERS (4751)
363 PRODUCTION COORDINATORS (4752)
364 TRAFFIC, SHIPPING, AND RECEIVING CLERKS (4753)
365 STOCK AND INVENTORY CLERKS (4754)
366 METER READERS (4755)
368 WEIGHERS, MEASURERS, AND CHECKERS (4756)
369 SAMPLERS (4757)
373 EXPEDITERS (4758)
374 MATERIAL RECORDING, SCHEDULING, AND DISTRIBUTING CLERKS, N.E.C. (4759)

Adjusters and Investigators

(375) THROUGH (378) ARE RECODED TO: 32
375 INSURANCE ADJUSTERS, EXAMINERS, AND INVESTIGATORS (4782)
376 INVESTIGATORS AND ADJUSTERS, EXCEPT INSURANCE (4783)
377 ELIGIBILITY CLERKS, SOCIAL WELFARE (4784)
378 BILL AND ACCOUNT COLLECTORS (4786)

Miscellaneous Administrative Support Occupations

(379) THROUGH (389) ARE RECODED TO: 33
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379    GENERAL OFFICE CLERKS (463)
383    BANK TELLERS (4791)
384    PROOFREADERS (4792)
385    DATA-ENTRY KEYERS (4793)
386    STATISTICAL CLERKS (4794)
387    TEACHERS' AIDES (4795)
389    ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT OCCUPATIONS, N.E.C. (4787, 4799)
------------------------------------------------------------

SERVICE OCCUPATIONS

Private Household Occupations

(403) THROUGH (407) ARE RECODED TO: 34

403    LAUNDERERS AND IRONERS (503)
404    COOKS, PRIVATE HOUSEHOLD (504)
405    HOUSEKEEPERS AND BUTLERS (505)
406    CHILD CARE WORKERS, PRIVATE HOUSEHOLD (506)
407    PRIVATE HOUSEHOLD CLEANERS AND SERVANTS
       (502, 507, 509)
------------------------------------------------------------

Protective Service Occupations

...............
-supervisors, protective service occupations-

(413) THROUGH (415) ARE RECODED TO: 35

413    SUPERVISORS, FIREFIGHTING AND FIRE PREVENTION
       OCCUPATIONS (5111)
414    SUPERVISORS, POLICE AND DETECTIVES (5112)
415    SUPERVISORS, GUARDS (5113)
------------------------------------------------------------

-firefighting and fire prevention occupations-

(416) THROUGH (417) ARE RECODED TO: 35

416    FIRE INSPECTION AND FIRE PREVENTION OCCUPATIONS
       (5122)
417    FIREFIGHTING OCCUPATIONS (5123)
------------------------------------------------------------

-police and detectives-

(418) THROUGH (424) ARE RECODED TO: 35

418    POLICE AND DETECTIVES, PUBLIC SERVICE (5132)
423    SHERIFFS, BAILIFFS, AND OTHER LAW ENFORCEMENT
       OFFICERS (5134)
424    CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION OFFICERS (5133)
------------------------------------------------------------

-guards-

(425) THROUGH (427) ARE RECODED TO: 35

Service Occupations, except Protective and Household

- **food preparation and service occupations**-

(433) THROUGH (444) ARE RECODED TO: 36

433 SUPERVISORS, FOOD PREPARATION AND SERVICE OCCUPATIONS (5211)
434 BARTENDERS (5212)
435 WAITERS AND WAITRESSES (5213)
436 COOKS, EXCEPT SHORT ORDER (5214)
437 SHORT-ORDER COOKS (5215)
438 FOOD COUNTER, FOUNTAIN AND RELATED OCCUPATIONS (5216)
439 KITCHEN WORKERS, FOOD PREPARATION (5217)
443 WAITERS'/WAITRESSES' ASSISTANTS (5218)
444 MISCELLANEOUS FOOD PREPARATION OCCUPATIONS (5219)

- **health service occupations**-

(435) THROUGH (447) ARE RECODED TO: 37

445 DENTAL ASSISTANTS (5232)
446 HEALTH AIDS, EXCEPT NURSING (5233)
447 NURSING AIDS, ORDERLIES, AND ATTENDANTS (5236)

- **cleaning and building service occupations, exc. household**-

(448) THROUGH (455) ARE RECODED TO: 38

448 SUPERVISORS, CLEANING AND BUILDING SERVICE WORKERS (5241)
449 MAIDS AND HOUSEMEN (5242, 5249)
453 JANITORS AND CLEANERS (5244)
454 ELEVATOR OPERATORS (5245)
455 PEST CONTROL OCCUPATIONS (5246)

- **personal service occupations**-

(456) THROUGH (469) ARE RECODED TO: 39

456 SUPERVISORS, PERSONAL SERVICE OCCUPATIONS (5251)
457 BARBERS (5252)
458 HAIRDRESSERS AND COSMETOLOGISTS (5253)
459 ATTENDANTS, AMUSEMENT AND RECREATION FACILITIES (5254)
463 GUIDES (5255)
464 USHERS (5256)
465 PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ATTENDANTS (5257)
FARMING, FORESTRY, AND FISHING OCCUPATIONS

Farm Operators and Managers

(473) THROUGH (476) ARE RECODED TO: 40

473  FARMERS, EXCEPT HORTICULTURAL (5512-5514)
474  HORTICULTURAL SPECIALTY FARMERS (5515)
475  MANAGERS, FARMS, EXCEPT HORTICULTURAL (5522-5524)
476  MANAGERS, HORTICULTURAL SPECIALTY FARMS (5525)

Other Agricultural and Related Occupations

-farm occupations, except managerial-

(477) THROUGH (484) ARE RECODED TO: 41

477  SUPERVISORS, FARM WORKERS (5611)
479  FARM WORKERS (5612-5617)
483  MARINE LIFE CULTIVATION WORKERS (5618)
484  NURSERY WORKERS (5619)

-related agricultural occupations-

(485) THROUGH (489) ARE RECODED TO: 42

485  SUPERVISORS, RELATED AGRICULTURAL OCCUPATIONS (5621)
486  GROUNDSKEEPERS AND GARDENERS, EXCEPT FARM (5622)
487  ANIMAL CARETAKERS, EXCEPT FARM (5624)
488  GRADERS AND SORTERS, AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS (5625)
489  INSPECTORS, AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS (5627)

-forestry and logging occupations-

(494) THROUGH (496) ARE RECODED TO: 43

494  SUPERVISORS, FORESTRY AND LOGGING WORKERS (571)
495  FORESTRY WORKERS, EXCEPT LOGGING (572)
496  TIMBER CUTTING AND LOGGING OCCUPATIONS (573, 579)

-fishers, hunters, and trappers-

(497) THROUGH (499) ARE RECODED TO: 43

497  CAPTAINS AND OTHER OFFICERS, FISHING VESSELS (PT 8241)
498  FISHERS (583)
-mechanics and repairers, vehicle and mobile equipment-

(505) THROUGH (517) ARE RECODED TO: 44

505  AUTOMOBILE MECHANICS (PT 6111)
506  AUTOMOBILE MECHANIC APPRENTICES (PT 6111)
507  BUS, TRUCK, AND STATIONARY ENGINE MECHANICS (6112)
508  AIRCRAFT ENGINE MECHANICS (6113)
509  SMALL ENGINE REPAIRERS (6114)
514  AUTOMOBILE BODY AND RELATED REPAIRERS (6115)
515  AIRCRAFT MECHANICS, EXCEPT ENGINE (6116)
516  HEAVY EQUIPMENT MECHANICS (6117)
517  FARM EQUIPMENT MECHANICS (6118)

-mechanics and repairers, except vehicle and mobile equipment-

(518) THROUGH (534) ARE RECODED TO: 45

518  INDUSTRIAL MACHINERY REPAIRERS (613)
519  MACHINERY MAINTENANCE OCCUPATIONS (614) ELECTRICAL AND ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT REPAIRERS
523  ELECTRONIC REPAIRERS, COMMUNICATIONS AND INDUSTRIAL EQUIPMENT (6151, 6153, 6155)
525  DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT REPAIRERS (6154)
526  HOUSEHOLD APPLIANCE AND POWER TOOL REPAIRERS (6156)
527  TELEPHONE LINE INSTALLERS AND REPAIRERS (6157)
529  TELEPHONE INSTALLERS AND REPAIRERS (6158)
533  MISCELLANEOUS ELECTRICAL AND ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT REPAIRERS (6152, 6159)
534  HEATING, AIR CONDITIONING, AND REFRIGERATION MECHANICS (616)

-miscellaneous mechanics and repairers-

(535) THROUGH (549) ARE RECODED TO: 46

535  CAMERA, WATCH, AND MUSICAL INSTRUMENT REPAIRERS (6171, 6172)
536  LOCKSMITHS AND SAFE REPAIRERS (6173)
538  OFFICE MACHINE REPAIRERS (6174)
539  MECHANICAL CONTROLS AND VALVE REPAIRERS (6175)
543  ELEVATOR INSTALLERS AND REPAIRERS (6176)
544  MILLWRIGHTS (6178)
547  SPECIFIED MECHANICS AND REPAIRERS, N.E.C. (6177, 6179)
549  NOT SPECIFIED MECHANICS AND REPAIRERS

-Construction Trades-

--supervisors, construction occupations--

(553) THROUGH (558) ARE RECODED TO: 47
SUPERVISORS; BRICKMASONS, STONEMASONS, AND TILE SETTERS (6312)
SUPERVISORS, CARPENTERS AND RELATED WORKERS (6313)
SUPERVISORS, ELECTRICIANS AND POWER TRANSMISSION INSTALLERS (6314)
SUPERVISORS; PAINTERS, PAPERHANGERS, AND PLASTERERS (6315)
SUPERVISORS; PLUMBERS, PIPEFITTERS, AND STEAMFITTERS (6316)
SUPERVISORS, N.E.C. (6311, 6318)

- construction trades, except supervisors -

(563) THROUGH (599) ARE RECODED TO: 48

BRICKMASONS AND STONEMASONS, (PT 6412, PT 6413)
BRICKMASON AND STONEMASON APPRENTICES (PT 6412, PT 6413)
TILE SETTERS, HARD AND SOFT (6414, PT 6462)
CARPET INSTALLERS (PT 6462)
CARPENTERS (PT 6422)
CARPENTER APPRENTICES (PT 6422)
DRYWALL INSTALLERS (6424)
ELECTRICIANS (PT 6432)
ELECTRICIAN APPRENTICES (PT 6432)
ELECTRICAL POWER INSTALLERS AND REPAIRERS (6433)
PAINTERS, CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE (6442)
PAPERHANGERS (6443)
PLASTERERS (6444)
PLUMBERS, PIPEFITTERS, AND STEAMFITTERS (PT 645)
PLUMBER, PIPEFITTER, AND STEAMFITTER APPRENTICES (PT 645)
CONCRETE AND TERRAZZO FINISHERS (6463)
GLAZIERS (6464)
INSULATION WORKERS (6465)
PAVING, SURFACING, AND TAMPPING EQUIPMENT OPERATORS (6466)
ROOFERS (6468)
SHEETMETAL DUCT INSTALLERS (6472)
STRUCTURAL METAL WORKERS (6473)
DRILLERS, EARTH (6474)
CONSTRUCTION TRADES, N.E.C. (6467, 6475, 6476, 6479)

Extractive Occupations

(613) THROUGH (617) ARE RECODED TO: 49

SUPERVISORS, EXTRACTIVE OCCUPATIONS (632)
DRILLERS, OIL WELL (652)
EXPLOSIVES WORKERS (653)
MINING MACHINE OPERATORS (654)
MINING OCCUPATIONS, N.E.C. (656)
-production occupation supervisors-

(633) IS RECODED TO: 50

633 SUPERVISORS, PRODUCTION OCCUPATIONS (67, 71)

-precision metalworking occupations-

(634) THROUGH (655) ARE RECODED TO: 50

634 TOOL AND DIE MAKERS (PT 6811)
635 TOOL AND DIE MAKER APPRENTICES (PT 6811)
636 PRECISION ASSEMBLERS, METAL (6812)
637 MACHINISTS (PT 6813)
639 MACHINIST APPRENTICES (PT 6813)
643 BOILERMAKERS (6814)
644 PRECISION GRINDERS, FITTERS, AND TOOL SHARPENERS (6816)
645 PATTERNMAKERS AND MODEL MAKERS, METAL (6817)
646 LAY-OUT WORKERS (6821)
647 PRECIOUS STONES AND METALS WORKERS (JEWELERS) (6822, 6866)
649 ENGRAVERS, METAL (6823)
653 SHEET METAL WORKERS (PT 6824)
654 SHEET METAL WORKER APPRENTICES (PT 6824)
655 MISCELLANEOUS PRECISION METAL WORKERS (6829)

-precision woodworking occupations-

(656) THROUGH (659) ARE RECODED TO: 51

656 PATTERNMAKERS AND MODEL MAKERS, WOOD (6831)
657 CABINET MAKERS AND BENCH CARPENTERS (6832)
658 FURNITURE AND WOOD FINISHERS (6835)
659 MISCELLANEOUS PRECISION WOODWORKERS (6839)

-precision textile, apparel, and furnishings machine workers-

(666) THROUGH (674) ARE RECODED TO: 52

666 DRESSMAKERS (PT 6852, PT 7752)
667 TAILORS (PT 6852)
668 UPHOLSTERERS (6853)
669 SHOE REPAIRERS (6854)
673 APPAREL AND FABRIC PATTERNMAKERS (6856)
674 MISCELLANEOUS PRECISION APPAREL AND FABRIC WORKERS (6859, PT 7752)

-precision workers, assorted materials-

(675) THROUGH (684) ARE RECODED TO: 53
AND MOLDERS AND SHAPERS, EXCEPT JEWELERS (6861)

PATTERNMAKERS, LAY-OUT WORKERS, AND CUTTERS (6862)

OPTICAL GOODS WORKERS (6864, PT 7477, PT 7677)

DENTAL LABORATORY AND MEDICAL APPLIANCE TECHNICIANS (6865)

BOOKBINDERS (6844)

ELECTRICAL AND ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT ASSEMBLERS (6867)

MISCELLANEOUS PRECISION WORKERS, N.E.C. (6869)
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-precision food production occupations-

(686) THROUGH (688) ARE RECODED TO: 54

BUTCHERS AND MEAT CUTTERS (6871)

BAKERS (6872)

FOOD BATCHMAKERS (6873, 6879)
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-precision inspectors, testers and related workers-

(689) THROUGH (693) ARE RECODED TO: 55

INSPECTORS, TESTERS, AND GRADERS (6881, 828)

ADJUSTERS AND CALIBRATORS (6882)
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Plant and System Operators

(694) THROUGH (699) ARE RECODED TO: 56

WATER AND SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT OPERATORS (691)

POWER PLANT OPERATORS (PT 693)

STATIONARY ENGINEERS (PT 693, 7668)

MISCELLANEOUS PLANT AND SYSTEM OPERATORS (692, 694, 695, 696)
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

OPERATORS, FABRICATORS, AND LABORERS

Machine Operators, Assemblers, and Inspectors

-machinery operators and tenders, except precision:
metalworking and plastic working machine operators-

(703) THROUGH (717) ARE RECODED TO: 57

LATHE AND TURNING MACHINE SET-UP OPERATORS (7312)

LATHE AND TURNING MACHINE OPERATORS (7512)

MILLING AND PLANING MACHINE OPERATORS (7313, 7513)

PUNCHING AND STAMPING PRESS MACHINE OPERATORS (7314, 7317, 7514, 7517)

ROLLING MACHINE OPERATORS (7316, 7516)

DRILLING AND BORING MACHINE OPERATORS (7318, 7518)

GRINDING, ABRADING, BUFFING, AND POLISHING MACHINE OPERATORS (7322, 7324, 7522)

FORGING MACHINE OPERATORS (7319, 7519)
- machine operators and tenders, except precision:
  metal and plastic processing machine operators-
  (719) THROUGH (725) ARE RECODED TO: 58

719  MOLDING AND CASTING MACHINE OPERATORS (7315, 7342, 7515, 7542)
723  METAL PLATING MACHINE OPERATORS (7343, 7543)
724  HEAT TREATING EQUIPMENT OPERATORS (7344, 7544)
725  MISCELLANEOUS METAL AND PLASTIC PROCESSING MACHINE OPERATORS (7349, 7549)

- machine operators and tenders, except precision:
  woodworking machine operators-
  (726) THROUGH (733) ARE RECODED TO: 59

726  WOOD LATHE, ROUTING AND PLANING MACHINE OPERATORS (7431, 7432, 7631, 7632)
727  SAWING MACHINE OPERATORS (7433, 7633)
728  SHAPING AND JOINING MACHINE OPERATORS (7435, 7635)
729  NAILING AND TACKING MACHINE OPERATORS (7636)
733  MISCELLANEOUS WOODWORKING MACHINE OPERATORS (7434, 7439, 7634, 7639)

- machine operators and tenders, except precision:
  printing machine operators-
  (734) THROUGH (737) ARE RECODED TO: 60

734  PRINTING MACHINE OPERATORS (7443, 7643)
735  PHOTOENGRAVERS AND LITHOGRAPHERS (6842, 7444, 7644)
736  TYPESETTERS AND COMPOSITORS (6841, 7642)
737  MISCELLANEOUS PRINTING MACHINE OPERATORS (6849, 7449, 7649)

- machine operators and tenders, except precision:
  textile, apparel, and furnishings machine operators-
  (738) THROUGH (749) ARE RECODED TO: 61

738  WINDING AND TWISTING MACHINE OPERATORS (7451, 7651)
739  KNITTING, LOOPING, TAPING, AND WEAVING MACHINE OPERATORS (7452, 7652)
743  TEXTILE CUTTING MACHINE OPERATORS (7654)
744  TEXTILE SEWING MACHINE OPERATORS (7655)
745  SHOE MACHINE OPERATORS (7656)
747  PRESSING MACHINE OPERATORS (7657)
748  LAUNDERING AND DRY CLEANING MACHINE OPERATORS (6855, 7658)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>749</td>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS TEXTILE MACHINE OPERATORS (7459, 7659)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Machine operators and tenders, except precision:
  - Machine operators, assorted materials-
    - (753) THROUGH (779) ARE RECODED TO: 62

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>753</td>
<td>CEMENTING AND GLUING MACHINE OPERATORS (7661)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>754</td>
<td>PACKAGING AND FILLING MACHINE OPERATORS (7462, 7662)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>755</td>
<td>EXTRUDING AND FORMING MACHINE OPERATORS (7463, 7663)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>756</td>
<td>MIXING AND BLENDING MACHINE OPERATORS (7664)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>757</td>
<td>SEPARATING, FILTERING, AND CLARIFYING MACHINE OPERATORS (7476, 7666, 7676)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>758</td>
<td>COMPRESSING AND COMPACTING MACHINE OPERATORS (7467, 7667)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>759</td>
<td>PAINTING AND PAINT SPRAYING MACHINE OPERATORS (7669)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>763</td>
<td>ROASTING AND BAKING MACHINE OPERATORS, FOOD (7472, 7672)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>764</td>
<td>WASHING, CLEANING, AND PICKLING MACHINE OPERATORS (7673)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>765</td>
<td>FOLDING MACHINE OPERATORS (7474, 7674)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>766</td>
<td>FURNACE, KILN, AND OVEN OPERATORS, EXC. FOOD (7675)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>768</td>
<td>CRUSHING AND GRINDING MACHINE OPERATORS (PT 7477, PT 7677)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>769</td>
<td>SLICING AND CUTTING MACHINE OPERATORS (7478, 7678)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>773</td>
<td>MOTION PICTURE PROJECTIONISTS (PT 7479)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>774</td>
<td>PHOTOGRAPHIC PROCESS MACHINE OPERATORS (6863, 6868, 7671)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>777</td>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS MACHINE OPERATORS, N.E.C. (PT 7479, 7665, 7679)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>779</td>
<td>MACHINE OPERATORS, NOT SPECIFIED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Fabricators, assemblers, and hand working occupations-
  - (783) THROUGH (795) ARE RECODED TO: 63

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>783</td>
<td>WELDERS AND CUTTERS (7332, 7532, 7714)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>784</td>
<td>SOLDERERS AND BRAZERS (7333, 7533, 7717)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>785</td>
<td>ASSEMBLERS (772, 774)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>786</td>
<td>HAND CUTTING AND TRIMMING OCCUPATIONS (7753)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>787</td>
<td>HAND MOLDING, CASTING, AND FORMING OCCUPATIONS (7754, 7755)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>789</td>
<td>HAND PAINTING, COATING, AND DECORATING OCCUPATIONS (7756)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>793</td>
<td>HAND ENGRAVING AND PRINTING OCCUPATIONS (7757)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>794</td>
<td>HAND GRINDING AND POLISHING OCCUPATIONS (7758)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>795</td>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS HAND WORKING OCCUPATIONS (7759)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Production inspectors, testors, samplers, and weighers-
  - (796) THROUGH (799) ARE RECODED TO: 64
TRANSPORTATION AND MATERIAL MOVING OCCUPATIONS

MOTOR VEHICLE OPERATORS

(803) THROUGH (814) ARE RECODED TO: 65

803 SUPERVISORS, MOTOR VEHICLE OPERATORS (8111)
804 TRUCK DRIVERS, HEAVY (8212, 8213)
805 TRUCK DRIVERS, LIGHT (8214)
806 DRIVER-SALES WORKERS (8218)
808 BUS DRIVERS (8215)
809 TAXICAB DRIVERS AND CHAUFFEURS (8216)
813 PARKING LOT ATTENDANTS (874)
814 MOTOR TRANSPORTATION OCCUPATIONS, N.E.C. (8219)

RAIL TRANSPORTATION OCCUPATIONS

(823) THROUGH (826) ARE RECODED TO: 66

823 RAILROAD CONDUCTORS AND YARDMASTERS (8113)
824 LOCOMOTIVE OPERATING OCCUPATIONS (8232)
825 RAILROAD BRAKE, SIGNAL, AND SWITCH OPERATORS (8233)
826 RAIL VEHICLE OPERATORS, N.E.C. (8239)

WATER TRANSPORTATION OCCUPATIONS

(828) THROUGH (834) ARE RECODED TO: 66

828 SHIP CAPTAINS AND MATES, EXCEPT FISHING BOATS
     (PT 8241, 8242)
829 SAILORS AND DECKHANDS (8243)
833 MARINE ENGINEERS (8244)
834 BRIDGE, LOCK, AND LIGHTHOUSE TENDERS (8245)
(843) THROUGH (859) ARE RECODED TO: 67

843 SUPERVISORS, MATERIAL MOVING EQUIPMENT OPERATORS (812)
844 OPERATING ENGINEERS (8312)
845 LONGSHORE EQUIPMENT OPERATORS (8313)
848 HOIST AND WINCH OPERATORS (8314)
849 CRANE AND TOWER OPERATORS (8315)
853 EXCAVATING AND LOADING MACHINE OPERATORS (8316)
855 GRADER, DOZER, AND SCRAPER OPERATORS (8317)
856 INDUSTRIAL TRUCK AND TRACTOR EQUIPMENT OPERATORS (8318)
859 MISCELLANEOUS MATERIAL MOVING EQUIPMENT OPERATORS (8319)

Handlers, Equipment Cleaners, Helpers, and Laborers

(863) THROUGH (873) ARE RECODED TO: 68

863 SUPERVISORS; HANDLERS, EQUIPMENT CLEANERS, AND LABORERS, N.E.C. (85)
864 HELPERS, MECHANICS AND REPAIRERS (863)

HELPERS, CONSTRUCTION AND EXTRACTIVE OCCUPATIONS

865 HELPERS, CONSTRUCTION TRADES (8641-8645, 8648)
866 HELPERS, SURVEYOR (8646)
867 HELPERS, EXTRACTIVE OCCUPATIONS (865)
869 CONSTRUCTION LABORERS (871)
873 PRODUCTION HELPERS (861, 862)

Freight, Stock, and Material Handlers

(875) THROUGH (883) ARE RECODED TO: 69

875 GARBAGE COLLECTORS (8722)
876 STEVEDORES (8723)
877 STOCK HANDLERS AND BAGGERS (8724)
878 MACHINE FEEDERS AND OFFBEARERS (8725)
883 FREIGHT, STOCK, AND MATERIAL HANDLERS, N.E.C. (8726)

(885) THROUGH (889) ARE RECODED TO: 70

885 GARAGE AND SERVICE STATION RELATED OCCUPATIONS (873)
887 VEHICLE WASHERS AND EQUIPMENT CLEANERS (875)
888 HAND PACKERS AND PACKAGERS (8761)
889 LABORERS, EXCEPT CONSTRUCTION (8769)

(900) IS RECODED TO: 71

900 CURRENT MEMBER OF THE ARMED FORCES (NOT A CENSUS CODE)
(999) IS RECODED TO: 90

999 OCCUPATION NOT REPORTED (CODE USED WHEN NOT-REPORTED CASES ARE NOT ALLOCATED)

>> MASTER CODE

CENSUS INDUSTRY CODES

NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES FOLLOWING INDUSTRY CATEGORIES ARE THE U.S DEPT. OF COMMERCE 1972 STANDARD INDUSTRIAL CLASSIFICATION (SIC) DEFINITIONS. THE ABBREVIATION "PT" MEANS "PART" AND "N.E.C." MEANS "NOT ELSEWHERE CLASSIFIED."

AGRICULTURE, FORESTRY, AND FISHERIES

010 AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION, CROPS (01)
011 AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION, LIVESTOCK (02)
020 AGRICULTURAL SERVICES, EXCEPT HORTICULTURAL (07, EXCEPT 078)
021 HORTICULTURAL SERVICES (078)
030 FORESTRY (08)
031 FISHING, HUNTING, AND TRAPPING (09)

MINING

040 METAL MINING (10)
041 COAL MINING (11, 12)
042 CRUDE PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS EXTRACTION (13)
050 NONMETALLIC MINING AND QUARRYING, EXCEPT FUEL (14)
060 CONSTRUCTION (15, 16, 17)

MANUFACTURING

NONDURABLE GOODS: FOOD AND KINDRED PRODUCTS

100 MEAT PRODUCTS (201)
101 DAIRY PRODUCTS (202)
102 CANNED AND PRESERVED FRUITS AND VEGETABLES (203)
110 GRAIN MILL PRODUCTS (204)
111 BAKERY PRODUCTS (205)
112 SUGAR AND CONFECTIONERY PRODUCTS (206)
120 BEVERAGE INDUSTRIES (208)
121 MISCELLANEOUS FOOD PREPARATIONS AND KINDRED PRODUCTS (207, 209)
122 NOT SPECIFIED FOOD INDUSTRIES
130 TOBACCO MANUFACTURES (21)

NONDURABLE GOODS: TEXTILE MILL PRODUCTS

132 KNITTING MILLS (225)
140 DYEING AND FINISHING TEXTILES, EXCEPT WOOL AND KNIT GOODS (226)
141 FLOOR COVERINGS, EXCEPT HARD SURFACE (227)
142 YARN, THREAD, AND FABRIC MILLS (228, 221-224)
MISCELLANEOUS TEXTILE MILL PRODUCTS (229)

NONDURABLE GOODS: APPAREL AND OTHER FINISHED TEXTILE PRODUCTS

150 MISCELLANEOUS TEXTILE MILL PRODUCTS (229)
151 APPAREL AND ACCESSORIES, EXCEPT KNIT (231-238)
152 MISCELLANEOUS FABRICATED TEXTILE PRODUCTS (239)

NONDURABLE GOODS: PAPER AND ALLIED PRODUCTS

160 PULP, PAPER, AND PAPERBOARD MILLS (261-263, 266)
161 MISCELLANEOUS PAPER AND PULP PRODUCTS (264)
162 PAPERBOARD CONTAINERS AND BOXES (265)

NONDURABLE GOODS: PRINTING, PUBLISHING AND ALLIED INDUSTRIES

170 NEWSPAPER PUBLISHING AND PRINTING (271)
172 PRINTING, PUBLISHING AND ALLIED INDUSTRIES, EXCEPT NEWSPAPERS (272-279)

NONDURABLE GOODS: CHEMICALS AND ALLIED PRODUCTS

180 PLASTICS, SYNTHETICS, AND RESINS (282)
181 DRUGS (283)
182 SOAPS AND COSMETICS (284)
190 PAINTS, VARNISHES, AND RELATED PRODUCTS (285)
191 AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS (287)
192 INDUSTRIAL AND MISCELLANEOUS CHEMICALS (281, 286, 289)

NONDURABLE GOODS: PETROLEUM AND COAL PRODUCTS

200 PETROLEUM REFINING (291)
201 MISCELLANEOUS PETROLEUM AND COAL PRODUCTS (295, 299)

NONDURABLE GOODS: RUBBER AND MISCELLANEOUS PLASTICS PRODUCTS

210 TIRES AND INNER TUBES (301)
211 OTHER RUBBER PRODUCTS, AND PLASTICS FOOTWEAR AND BELTING (302-304, 306)
212 MISCELLANEOUS PLASTIC PRODUCTS (307)

NONDURABLE GOODS: LEATHER AND LEATHER PRODUCTS

220 LEATHER TANNING AND FINISHING (311)
221 FOOTWEAR, EXCEPT RUBBER AND PLASTIC (313, 314)
222 LEATHER PRODUCTS, EXCEPT FOOTWEAR (315-317, 319)

DURABLE GOODS: LUMBER AND WOOD PRODUCTS, EXCEPT FURNITURE

230 LOGGING (241)
231 SAWMILLS, PLANING MILLS, AND MILLWORK (242, 243)
232 WOOD BUILDINGS AND MOBILE HOMES (245)
241 MISCELLANEOUS WOOD PRODUCTS (244, 249)
242 FURNITURE AND FIXTURES (25)
DURABLE GOODS: STONE, CLAY, GLASS AND CONCRETE PRODUCTS

250    GLASS AND GLASS PRODUCTS (321-323)
251    CEMENT, CONCRETE, GYPSUM, AND PLASTER PRODUCTS
       (324, 327)
252    STRUCTURAL CLAY PRODUCTS (325)
261    POTTERY AND RELATED PRODUCTS (326)
262    MISCELLANEOUS NONMETALLIC MINERAL AND STONE
       PRODUCTS (328, 329)

DURABLE GOODS: METAL INDUSTRIES

270    BLAST FURNACES, STEELWORKS, ROLLING AND FINISHING
       MILLS (331)
271    IRON AND STEEL FOUNDRIES (332)
272    PRIMARY ALUMINUM INDUSTRIES (3334, PT 334,
       3353-3355, 3361)
280    OTHER PRIMARY METAL INDUSTRIES (3331-3333, 3339,
       PT 334, 3351, 3356, 3357, 3362, 3369, 339)
281    CUTLERY, HAND TOOLS, AND OTHER HARDWARE (342)
282    FABRICATED STRUCTURAL METAL PRODUCTS (344)
290    SCREW MACHINE PRODUCTS (345)
291    METAL FORGINGS AND STAMPINGS (346)
292    ORDNANCE (348)
300    MISCELLANEOUS FABRICATED METAL PRODUCTS (341,
       343, 347, 349)
301    NOT SPECIFIED METAL INDUSTRIES

DURABLE GOODS: MACHINERY, EXCEPT ELECTRICAL

310    ENGINES AND TURBINES (351)
311    FARM MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT (352)
312    CONSTRUCTION AND MATERIAL HANDLING MACHINES (353)
320    METALWORKING MACHINERY (354)
321    OFFICE AND ACCOUNTING MACHINES (357, EXCEPT 3573)
322    ELECTRONIC COMPUTING EQUIPMENT (3573)
331    MACHINERY, EXCEPT ELECTRICAL, N.E.C. (355,
       356, 358, 359)
332    NOT SPECIFIED MACHINERY DURABLE GOODS: ELECTRICAL
       MACHINERY, EQUIPMENT, AND SUPPLIES
340    HOUSEHOLD APPLIANCES (363)
341    RADIO, TV, AND COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT (365, 366)
342    ELECTRICAL MACHINERY, EQUIPMENT, AND SUPPLIES,
       N.E.C. (361, 362, 364, 367, 369)
350    NOT SPECIFIED ELECTRICAL MACHINERY, EQUIPMENT, AND
       SUPPLIES MANUFACTURING (cont.)

DURABLE GOODS: TRANSPORTATION EQUIPMENT

351    MOTOR VEHICLES AND MOTOR VEHICLE EQUIPMENT (371)
352    AIRCRAFT AND PARTS (372)
360    SHIP AND BOAT BUILDING AND REPAIRING (373)
361    RAILROAD LOCOMOTIVES AND EQUIPMENT (374)
362    GUIDED MISSILES, SPACE VEHICLES, AND OTHER PARTS
       (376)
370    CYCLES AND MISCELLANEOUS TRANSPORTATION EQUIPMENT
       (375, 379)
DURABLE GOODS: PROFESSIONAL AND PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT, AND WATCHES

371  SCIENTIFIC AND CONTROLLING INSTRUMENTS (381, 382)
372  OPTICAL AND HEALTH SERVICES SUPPLIES (383, 384, 385)
380  PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES (386)
381  WATCHES, CLOCKS, AND CLOCKWORK OPERATED DEVICES (387)
382  NOT SPECIFIED PROFESSIONAL EQUIPMENT
390  TOYS, AMUSEMENT, AND SPORTING GOODS (394)
391  MISCELLANEOUS MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES (39 EXC.394)
392  NOT SPECIFIED MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES

TRANSPORTATION, COMMUNICATIONS, AND OTHER PUBLIC UTILITIES

TRANSPORTATION

400  RAILROADS (40)
401  BUS SERVICE AND URBAN TRANSIT (41, EXCEPT 412)
402  TAXICAB SERVICE (412)
410  TRUCKING SERVICE (421, 423)
411  WAREHOUSING AND STORAGE (422)
412  U.S. POSTAL SERVICE (43)
420  WATER TRANSPORTATION (44)
421  AIR TRANSPORTATION (45)
422  PIPE LINES, EXCEPT NATURAL GAS (46)
432  SERVICES INCIDENTAL TO TRANSPORTATION (47)

COMMUNICATIONS

440  RADIO AND TELEVISION BROADCASTING (483)
441  TELEPHONE (WIRE AND RADIO) (481)
442  TELEGRAPH AND MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATION SERVICES (482, 489)

UTILITIES AND SANITARY SERVICES

460  ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER (491)
461  GAS AND STEAM SUPPLY SYSTEMS (492, 496)
462  ELECTRIC AND GAS, AND OTHER COMBINATIONS (493)
470  WATER SUPPLY AND IRRIGATION (494, 497)
471  SANITARY SERVICES (495)
472  NOT SPECIFIED UTILITIES

WHOLESALE TRADE

DURABLE GOODS

500  MOTOR VEHICLES AND EQUIPMENT (501)
501  FURNITURE AND HOME FURNISHINGS (502)
502  LUMBER AND CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS (503)
510  SPORTING GOODS, TOYS AND HOBBY GOODS (504)
511  METALS AND MINERALS, EXCEPT PETROLEUM (505)
512  ELECTRICAL GOODS (506)
521  HARDWARE, PLUMBING AND HEATING SUPPLIES (507)
| 522 | NOT SPECIFIED ELECTRICAL AND HARDWARE PRODUCTS |
| 530 | MACHINERY, EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES (508) |
| 531 | SCRAP AND WASTE MATERIALS (5093) |
| 532 | MISCELLANEOUS WHOLESALE, DURABLE GOODS (5094, 5099) |

**Nondurable Goods**

| 540 | PAPER AND PAPER PRODUCTS (511) |
| 541 | DRUGS, CHEMICALS, AND ALLIED PRODUCTS (512, 516) |
| 542 | APPAREL, FABRICS, AND NOTIONS (513) |
| 550 | GROCERIES AND RELATED PRODUCTS (514) |
| 551 | FARM PRODUCTS-RAW MATERIALS (515) |
| 552 | PETROLEUM PRODUCTS (517) |
| 560 | ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES (518) |
| 562 | MISCELLANEOUS WHOLESALE, NONDURABLE GOODS (5194, 5198, 5199) |

**Retail Trade**

| 580 | LUMBER AND BUILDING MATERIAL RETAILING (521, 523) |
| 581 | HARDWARE STORES (525) |
| 582 | RETAIL NURSERIES AND GARDEN STORES (526) |
| 590 | MOBILE HOME DEALERS (527) |
| 591 | DEPARTMENT STORES (531) |
| 592 | VARIETY STORES (533) |
| 600 | MISCELLANEOUS GENERAL MERCHANDISE STORES (539) |
| 601 | GROCERY STORES (541) |
| 602 | DAIRY PRODUCTS STORES (545) |
| 610 | RETAIL BAKERIES (546) |
| 611 | FOOD STORES, N.E.C. (542, 543, 544, 549) |
| 612 | MOTOR VEHICLES DEALERS (551, 552) |
| 620 | AUTO AND HOME SUPPLY STORES (553) |
| 621 | GASOLINE SERVICE STATIONS (554) |
| 622 | MISCELLANEOUS VEHICLE DEALERS (555, 556, 557, 559) |
| 630 | APPAREL AND ACCESSORY STORES, EXCEPT SHOE (56, EXCEPT 566) |
| 631 | SHOE STORES (566) |
| 632 | FURNITURE AND HOME FURNISHINGS STORES (571) |
| 640 | HOUSEHOLD APPLIANCES, TV, AND RADIO STORES (572, 573) |
| 641 | EATING AND DRINKING PLACES (58) |
| 642 | DRUG STORES (591) |
| 650 | LIQUOR STORES (592) |
| 651 | SPORTING GOODS, BICYCLES, AND HOBBY STORES (5941, 5945, 5946) |
| 652 | BOOK AND STATIONERY STORES (5942, 5943) |
| 660 | JEWELRY STORES (5944) |
| 661 | SEWING, NEEDLEWORK, AND PIECE GOODS STORES (5949) |
| 662 | MAIL ORDER HOUSES (5961) |
| 670 | VENDING MACHINE OPERATORS (5962) |
| 671 | DIRECT SELLING ESTABLISHMENTS (5963) |
| 672 | FUEL AND ICE DEALERS (598) |
| 681 | RETAIL FLORISTS (5992) |
| 682 | MISCELLANEOUS RETAIL STORES (593, 5947, 5948, 5993, 5994, 5999) |
### FINANCE, INSURANCE, AND REAL ESTATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>691</td>
<td>NOT SPECIFIED RETAIL TRADE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>BANKING (60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701</td>
<td>SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS (612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>702</td>
<td>CREDIT AGENCIES, N.E.C. (61, EXCEPT 612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710</td>
<td>SECURITY, COMMODITY BROKERAGE, AND INVESTMENT COMPANIES (62, 67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>711</td>
<td>INSURANCE (63, 64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>712</td>
<td>REAL ESTATE, INCLUDING REAL ESTATE-INSURANCE-LAW OFFICES (65, 66)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BUSINESS AND REPAIR SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>721</td>
<td>ADVERTISING (731)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>722</td>
<td>SERVICES TO DWELLINGS AND OTHER BUILDINGS (734)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>730</td>
<td>COMMERCIAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND TESTING LABS (7391, 7397)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>731</td>
<td>PERSONNEL SUPPLY SERVICES (736)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>732</td>
<td>BUSINESS MANAGEMENT AND CONSULTING SERVICES (7392)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>740</td>
<td>COMPUTER AND DATA PROCESSING SERVICES (737)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>741</td>
<td>DETECTIVE AND PROTECTIVE SERVICES (7393)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>742</td>
<td>BUSINESS SERVICES, N.E.C. (732, 733, 735, 7394, 7395, 7396, 7399)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750</td>
<td>AUTOMOTIVE SERVICES, EXCEPT REPAIR (751, 752, 754)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>751</td>
<td>AUTOMOTIVE REPAIR SHOPS (753)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>752</td>
<td>ELECTRICAL REPAIR SHOPS (762, 7694)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>760</td>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS REPAIR SERVICES (763, 764, 7692, 7699)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PERSONAL SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>761</td>
<td>PRIVATE HOUSEHOLDS (88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>762</td>
<td>HOTELS AND MOTELS (701)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770</td>
<td>LODGING PLACES, EXCEPT HOTELS AND MOTELS (702, 703, 704)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>771</td>
<td>LAUNDRY, CLEANING, AND GARMENT SERVICES (721)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772</td>
<td>BEAUTY SHOPS (723)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>780</td>
<td>BARBER SHOPS (724)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>781</td>
<td>FUNERAL SERVICE AND CREMATORIES (726)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>782</td>
<td>SHOE REPAIR SHOPS (725)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>790</td>
<td>DRESSMAKING SHOPS (PT 729)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>791</td>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS PERSONAL SERVICES (722, PT 729)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ENTERTAINMENT AND RECREATION SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>THEATERS AND MOTION PICTURES (78, 792)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801</td>
<td>BOWLING ALLEYS, BILLIARD AND POOL PARLORS (793)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802</td>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS ENTERTAINMENT AND RECREATION SERVICES (791, 794, 799)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROFESSIONAL AND RELATED SERVICES
812 OFFICES OF PHYSICIANS (801, 803)
820 OFFICES OF DENTISTS (802)
821 OFFICES OF CHIROPRACTORS (8041)
822 OFFICES OF OPTOMETRISTS (8042)
830 OFFICES OF HEALTH PRACTITIONERS, N.E.C. (8049)
831 HOSPITALS (806)
832 NURSING AND PERSONAL CARE FACILITIES (805)
840 HEALTH SERVICES, N.E.C. (807, 808, 809)
841 LEGAL SERVICES (81)
842 ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS (821)
850 COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (822)
851 BUSINESS, TRADE AND VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS (824)
852 LIBRARIES (823)
860 EDUCATIONAL SERVICES, N.E.C (829)
861 JOB TRAINING AND VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION SERVICES (833)
862 CHILD DAY CARE SERVICES (835)
870 RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITIES, WITHOUT NURSING (836)
871 SOCIAL SERVICES, N.E.C. (832, 839)
872 MUSEUMS, ART GALLERIES, AND ZOOS (84)
880 RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS (866)
881 MEMBERSHIP ORGANIZATIONS (861-865, 869)
890 ACCOUNTING, AUDITING, AND BOOKKEEPING SERVICES (893)
891 NONCOMMERCIAL EDUCATIONAL AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH (892)
892 MISCELLANEOUS PROFESSIONAL AND RELATED SERVICES (899)

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

900 EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE OFFICES (911-913)
901 GENERAL GOVERNMENT, N.E.C (919)
910 JUSTICE, PUBLIC ORDER, AND SAFETY (92)
921 PUBLIC FINANCE, TAXATION, AND MONETARY POLICY (93)
922 ADMINISTRATION OF HUMAN RESOURCES PROGRAMS (94)
930 ADMINISTRATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND HOUSING PROGRAMS (95)
931 ADMINISTRATION OF ECONOMIC PROGRAMS (96)
932 NATIONAL SECURITY AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS (97)

990 INDUSTRY NOT REPORTED

>> MASTER CODE

ICPSR STATE AND COUNTRY CODES

UNITED STATES:

New England
   101 Connecticut
   102 Maine
   103 Massachusetts
   104 New Hampshire
   105 Rhode Island
106    Vermont
109    General mention of area; two or more states in area

Middle Atlantic
111    Delaware
112    New Jersey
113    New York
114    Pennsylvania
118    General mention of area; two or more states in area

-------------------
119    EAST; MENTION OF STATES IN BOTH NEW ENGLAND AND MIDDLE ATLANTIC

East North Central
121    Illinois
122    Indiana
123    Michigan
124    Ohio
125    Wisconsin
129    General mention of area; two or more states in area

West North Central
131    Iowa
132    Kansas
133    Minnesota
134    Missouri
135    Nebraska
136    North Dakota
137    South Dakota
138    General mention of area; two or more states in area

-------------------
139    MIDWEST; MENTION OF STATES IN BOTH EAST NORTH CENTRAL AND WEST North Central

Solid South
141    Alabama
142    Arkansas
143    Florida
144    Georgia
145    Louisiana
146    Mississippi
147    North Carolina
148    South Carolina
149    Texas
150    Virginia
157    General mention of area; the South; two or more states in area

Border States
151    Kentucky
152    Maryland
153    Oklahoma
154    Tennessee
155    Washington, D.C.
156    West Virginia
158    General mention of area; two or more states in area

-------------------
159    SOUTH; MENTION OF STATES IN BOTH SOLID SOUTH AND BORDER STATES

Mountain States
161    Arizona
162    Colorado
163    Idaho
164    Montana
165    Nevada
166    New Mexico
167    Utah
168    Wyoming
169    General mention of area; two or more states in area

Pacific States
171    California
172    Oregon
173    Washington
178    General mention of area; two or more states in area

---------------------
179    WEST; MENTION OF STATES IN BOTH MOUNTAIN STATES AND PACIFIC STATES

External States and Territories
180    Alaska
181    Hawaii
182    Puerto Rico
183    American Samoa, Guam
184    Panama Canal Zone
185    Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands
186    Virgin Islands
187    Other U.S. Dependencies

Reference to Two or More States from Different Regions of the United States; or NA Which State
191    Northeast and South (New England or Middle Atlantic and Solid South or Border States)
192    Northeast and Midwest (New England or Middle Atlantic and East North Central or West North Central)
194    West (Mountain States or Pacific States) and Midwest; West and Northeast
195    West and South (Solid South or Border States)
196    Midwest and South

--------------------
198    Lived in 3 or more regions (NA whether lived in one more than the rest)
199    United States, NA which state

WESTERN HEMISPHERE   Except U.S.

North America
201    North America (except U.S.) comb. Canada, Mexico, and/or Central America
207    Canada -- ancestry of Anglo-Saxon origin
208    Canada -- ancestry of French origin
209    Canada -- NA origin or other origin
219    Mexico
229    Central America

West Indies (except Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands)
231    Barbados
232    Cuba
233    Dominican Republic
234    Haiti
235    Jamaica
236    Netherlands Antilles
237    Trinidad and Tobago
238    Islands of Lesser Antilles--except Virgin Islands and Netherlands Antilles
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>West Indies (except Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands) or &quot;Caribbean&quot;—reference to two or more West Indian countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>South America; South American country or countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EUROPE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>British Isles</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Ireland (NA North or South); southern Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Northern Ireland (Ulster)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>Scot-Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>United Kingdom; Great Britain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>&quot;BRITISH ISLES&quot;; GENERAL MENTION OF AREA; REFERENCE TO TWO OR MORE COUNTRIES OF THE BRITISH ISLES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Western Europe</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>Federal Republic of Germany (W. Germany)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>German Democratic Republic (E. Germany)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>Germany—NA East or West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>Netherlands; Holland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>&quot;WESTERN EUROPE&quot;; GENERAL MENTION OF AREA; REFERENCE TO TWO OR MORE COUNTRIES OF WESTERN EUROPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>Scandinavia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eastern Europe</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>Czechoslovakia (Slavic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>Russia (or U.S.S.R.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>&quot;EASTERN EUROPE&quot;; GENERAL MENTION OF AREA; REFERENCE TO TWO OR MORE COUNTRIES OF EASTERN EUROPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balkan Countries</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341</td>
<td>Albania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Country/Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343</td>
<td>Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344</td>
<td>Rumania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348</td>
<td>General mention of area; reference to two or more Mediterranean Countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349</td>
<td>&quot;BALKANS&quot;; GENERAL REFERENCE OF AREA; REFERENCE TO COUNTRIES IN EASTERN EUROPE AND BALKAN COUNTRIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354</td>
<td>Malta or Gozo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399</td>
<td>&quot;EUROPE&quot;; GENERAL MENTION OF AREA; REFERENCE TO TWO OR MORE COUNTRIES OF EUROPE IN DIFFERENT AREAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>1990: Pakistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>428</td>
<td>Southeast Asia: Indochina, Thailand, Malaya, Burma, Philippines, Indonesia; Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td>China (mainland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432</td>
<td>1990: Taiwan, Formosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>434</td>
<td>Taiwan, Formosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452</td>
<td>Korea (North or South)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>499</td>
<td>&quot;ASIA&quot;; GENERAL MENTION OF AREA; REFERENCE TO TWO OR MORE COUNTRIES OF ASIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501</td>
<td>U.A.R. (Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>Iran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>Israel (or Palestine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508</td>
<td>Syria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>599</td>
<td>&quot;NEAR EAST&quot;; &quot;MIDDLE EAST&quot;; GENERAL MENTION OF AREA; REFERENCE TO TWO OR MORE COUNTRIES OF NEAR EAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>699</td>
<td>Africa; any African country or countries, excluding only South Africa and U.A.R. (Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>704</td>
<td>Australia, New Zealand, Tasmania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>997</td>
<td>Other (combinations) not codeable elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>998</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>999</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**>> MASTER CODE**

**IMPORTANT PROBLEMS CODE**

**SOCIAL WELFARE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>General reference to domestic issues;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
repairing/maintaining the nation's infrastructure (roads, bridges, dams, etc)
005 POPULATION; any mention of population increase; reference to over-population/birth control
006 DAY CARE; child care
010 UNEMPLOYMENT; the number of people with jobs; unemployment rate/compensation; job retraining
013 CREATE JOBS/RECRUIT INDUSTRY in specific area/region/state
020 EDUCATION; financial assistance for schools/colleges/students; quality of education/the learning environment/teaching
030 AGED/ELDERLY; social security benefits; administration of social security; medical care for the aged; medicare benefits; insuring against catastrophic illness
035 Social Security won't be around in the future; paying into a system which won't benefit me/them
040 HEALTH PROBLEMS/COST OF MEDICAL CARE; quality of medical care; medical research/training of doctors and other health personnel; hospitals; National Health insurance program
045 ** Located after 330
046 ** Located after 383
048 Other specific references to health problems; AIDS
050 HOUSING; providing housing for the poor/homeless; ability of young people to afford to buy homes/find homes to buy
060 POVERTY; aid to the poor/underprivileged people; help for the (truly) needy; welfare programs (such as ADC); general reference to anti-poverty programs; hunger/help for hungry people in the U.S.
090 SOCIAL WELFARE PROBLEMS; "welfare"--NFS
091 For general or other social welfare programs; "we need to help people more"
092 Against general or other social welfare programs; "too many give away programs for the people who don't deserve it"
099 Other specific mentions of social welfare problems
AGRICULTURE
100 FARM ECONOMICS; payment for crops/price of feed/cost of farming
103 SUBSIDIES/crop payments/government aid to farmers
120 WORLD FOOD PROBLEMS; food shortages/starvation/famine (not 406 or 407)
NATURAL RESOURCES
150 CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES; conservation, ecology; protecting the environment/endangered species
151 Controlling/REGULATING GROWTH or land development; banning further growth/development in crowded or ecologically sensitive areas; preserving natural areas
153 POLLUTION; clean air/water
154 Disposal of RADIOACTIVE/TOXIC waste (dumps, landfills)
160 DEVELOPMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES /ENERGY SOURCES;
harbors, dams, canals, irrigation, flood control, navigation, reclamation; location, mining, stock-piling of minerals; water power, atomic power; development of alternative sources of energy (includes mentions of solar or nuclear power)

Agriculture OR Natural Resources:
199 OTHER SPECIFIC MENTIONS OF AGRICULTURE OR NATURAL RESOURCES PROBLEMS

LABOR: UNION-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS
200 LABOR/UNION PROBLEMS; union practices; job security provided workers; job safety issues; working conditions
220 Anti-union; unions too powerful
299 Other specific mention of labor or union-management problems

RACIAL
300 CIVIL RIGHTS/RACIAL PROBLEMS; programs to enable Blacks to gain social/economic/educational/political equality; relations between Blacks and whites
302 PROTECTION (expansion) OF WHITE MAJORITY; maintenance of segregation; right to choose own neighborhood; right to discriminate in employment
304 Discrimination against whites; preferred treatment given to minorities

PUBLIC ORDER
320 NARCOTICS; availability of drugs; extent of drug/alcohol addiction in the U.S.; interdiction of drugs coming to the U.S. from foreign countries; alcohol or drug related crime
330 WOMEN'S RIGHTS; ref. to women's issues; economic equality for women; ERA
045 PRO-ABORTION; pro-choice; the right of a woman to control her body
340 CRIME/VIOLENCE; too much crime; streets aren't safe; mugging, murder, shoplifting; drug related crime
360 LAW AND ORDER; respect for the law/police; support for the police; death penalty; tougher sentences for criminals; need for more prisons
367 Against unregistered ownership of guns; legislative control of guns; "CONTROL OF GUNS"--NFS
368 For gun ownership; right to have guns; against gun control
370 EXTREMIST GROUPS/TERRORISTS; terrorist bombings/hostage-taking; political subversives; revolutionary ideas/approaches
380 General mention of MORAL/RELIGIOUS DECAY (of nation); sex, bad language, adult themes on TV
381 Family problems--divorce; proper treatment of children; decay of family (except 006); child/elder abuse (incl. sexual)
046 ANTI-ABORTION; pro-life; "abortion"--NFS
383 Problems of/with YOUNG PEOPLE; drug/alcohol abuse among young people; sexual attitudes; lack of values/discipline; mixed-up thinking; lack of goals/ambition/sense of responsibility
384 Religion (too) mixed up in politics; prayer in
385 HOMOSEXUALITY; protecting civil rights of gays and lesbians; accepting the lifestyle of homosexuals; granting homosexual couples the same rights and benefits as heterosexual couples
Racial OR Public Order OR Other Domestic:
399 OTHER SPECIFIC MENTION OF RACIAL OR PUBLIC ORDER PROBLEMS; OTHER MENTION OF DOMESTIC ISSUES
ECONOMIC AND BUSINESS
If R mentions both "inflation" (400) and rise in prices of specific items (407-409), code "inflation" (400). [SEE ALSO 496]
400 INFLATION; rate of inflation; level of prices; cost of living
401 WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS/GUIDELINES; freezing prices; control of business profits
403 High price of food, all mentions (exc. 100)
404 High price of other specific items and services
405 MINIMUM WAGE, any mention; any mention of wage levels
407 Food shortages; economic aspects of food shortages, e.g., price of sugar (other references, code 120)
408 Fuel shortages; "energy crisis"; oil companies making excessive profits; depressed condition of the oil industry
410 RECESSION, DEPRESSION; prosperity of the nation; economic growth; GNP
411 MONETARY RESTRAINTS/CONTROLS; level of interest rates; availability of money/the money supply
415 Against (increased) government spending; balancing of the (national) budget; against government stimulation of the economy; the size of the budget deficit
416 TAXES; general reference to tax structure; tax surcharge (NA R's direction); tax reform; other specific tax reference
417 For tax cuts; against tax surcharge; for tax reform
418 Against tax cuts; for tax surcharge; against tax reform
424 PRODUCTIVITY of American industry; "giving a day's work for a day's pay"; revitalizing American industry
425 STOCK MARKET/GOLD PRICES; all references to gold prices, stock brokers, stock fluctuations, etc.
427 VALUE OF THE DOLLAR; strength/weakness of the dollar against other currencies
433 Large businesses taking over small businesses
440 Class oriented economic concerns--middle class, working class (pro); MIDDLE CLASS GETTING SQUEEZED
441 Class oriented economic concerns--big business, monied interests (anti) too powerful
442 Concern for inequitable distribution of wealth; gap between the rich and the poor; concentration of wealth in the hands of a few
451 For the regulation of interstate commerce, transportation, air travel, railways, government auto safety regulations; in favor of increased...
government regulation of business; mention of problems caused by deregulation

452 Against (increased) regulation of interstate commerce, transportation; AIR TRAVEL, RAILWAYS, etc.

453 Solvency/stability/regulation/control of the nation's FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS. [1990] Savings and Loan scandal

460 IMMIGRATION POLICY; establishing limits on how many people from any one nation can enter the U.S.; prohibiting specified types of persons from entering the U.S.

463 Problems relating to the influx of political/economic refugees (Cubans, Haitians, Mexicans, etc.)

491 Economics--general; "Economics"--NFS

492 International economics--general

493 U.S. foreign trade, balance of payments position; foreign oil dependency

494 Control of FOREIGN INVESTMENT IN U.S.; mention of foreigners buying U.S. assets (businesses, real estate, stocks, etc)

495 PROTECTION OF U.S. INDUSTRIES; imposition of tariffs/reciprocal restrictions on foreign imports; limitation of foreign imports; mention of problems in specific industries competing with foreign manufacturers

496 The economy--not further specified (code specific mention if R clarifies by saying "inflation", etc.; also see 400)

497 International competitiveness; outsourcing; loss of jobs to foreign competition; moving jobs abroad; modernizing plants/equipment/management techniques to meet foreign competition; matching the quality of foreign goods

498 Mention of "twin problems" of a large national debt/budget deficit and unfavorable balance of trade/import-export ratio

499 Other specific mention economic or business problems

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

500 FOREIGN RELATIONS/FOREIGN AFFAIRS; foreign policy/relations, prestige abroad

504 Relations with the Third World (no specific country or region mentioned)

505 Relations with WESTERN EUROPE; Great Britain, France, Germany; our allies

510 VIETNAM; general reference to "the war," Indochina, Cambodia; aid

514 Latin America, South America--any references; reference to war/situation in Nicaragua; U.S. support of the Contras

515 Iran; mention of American hostages in Teheran; arms deal

516 African countries; developing areas in Africa (not 518)--any mention; U.S. response to apartheid in South Africa

519 Other specific countries/areas/trouble spots (exc. 520's, 530's)
524 MIDDLE EAST-- support or aid to Israel/Arab states; Arab/Israeli conflict; Iran-Iraq war; hostages in Lebanon/Middle East. [1990] Iraqi aggression in the Persian Gulf
530 RUSSIA/Eastern Europe; relations with Russia/the Communist bloc; detente/trade/negotiations with Russia -- NA whether 531 or 532
531 For PEACEFUL RELATIONS with Russia/Detente/Eastern Europe; for increased TRADE with Russia; talking/resuming negotiations with Russia on arms control/reduction (reaching/concluding a treaty is 711)
532 Against policy of Detente with Russia; COLD WAR; threat of external Communism; need to oppose/be wary of Russia
533 Prevention of Russian (Communist) expansion; mention of Soviet invasion and occupation of Afghanistan-- any reference; references to Soviet activity in Central America/Nicaragua)
539 Other specific references to Russia/Detente/Eastern Europe, etc. (including changing site/boycotting 1980 Moscow Olympics); threat of/preventing war with Russia (exc. 714)
540 FIRMNESS IN FOREIGN POLICY; maintenance of position of MILITARY/DIPLOMATIC STRENGTH (not 710-712)
550 U.S. FOREIGN (MILITARY) INVOLVEMENT/COMMITMENT, extent of U.S. Foreign involvement; military assistance/aid (exc. 524)
560 U.S. FOREIGN (ECONOMIC) INVOLVEMENT/COMMITMENTS; extent of U.S. (foreign) economic aid; "foreign aid"
570 Prevention of war; ESTABLISHMENT OF PEACE; any reference
585 Obligation to TAKE CARE OF PROBLEMS AT HOME before helping foreign countries
599 Other specific mention of foreign affairs problems
600 NATIONAL DEFENSE
700 NATIONAL DEFENSE; defense budget; level of spending on defense
710 DISARMAMENT; general reference to ENDING OF THE ARMS RACE; nuclear proliferation; test ban treaty (not 540); SALT; INF treaty
711 For DISARMAMENT; for extension of test ban treaty; support toward ending of arms race; against (additional) expenditures on military/arms development; SALT; SDI ("Star Wars"); INF treaty
712 Against (increased) policy of DISARMAMENT; against test ban treaty; for additional WEAPONS DEVELOPMENT; missile program; scientific/technological development in weapons/strategy; atomic bomb testing; increased DEFENSE BUDGET, increased arms expenditure (not 540); SALT; increased pay for military personnel; SDI ("Star Wars"); INF treaty
713 General or specific references to functioning and performance of defense; waste, inefficiency (not codeable in 710-712)
714 Nuclear war; the threat of nuclear war; nuclear
proliferation
740  The space program; space race (not 711,712)
750  MORALE OF NATION; Patriotism; National spirit;
national unity; greed, selfishness of people
760  BENEFITS FOR VETERANS; general reference
765  Allowing/accepting GAYS IN THE MILITARY
799  Other specific mention of national defense
problems

ISSUES RELATING TO THE FUNCTIONING OF GOVERNMENT
800  POWER OF THE (FEDERAL) GOVERNMENT; power
of/control exercised by the federal government
810  (LACK OF) HONESTY IN GOVERNMENT; (LACK OF) ETHICS
IN GOVERNMENT--general reference (exc. 811)
811  LACK OF PERSONAL ETHICS/morality of persons
related to or part of government
820  CAMPAIGN DONATIONS/PUBLIC FINANCING OF ELECTIONS;
any mentions
830  CONFIDENCE/TRUST in political leaders/system;
wisdom, ability, responsiveness of political
leaders; quality of leadership provided by
political leaders
833  QUALITY/EFFICIENCY of public employees, diplomats,
civil service; SIZE OF THE GOVERNMENT BUREAUCRACY;
COST OF GOVERNMENT
836  COMPENSATION; all references to the compensation
of government employees, officials, congressmen,
judges, local politicians/bureaucrats
837  Waste in government spending; keeping tabs on
where money goes
838  Government BUDGET PRIORITIES are wrong;
Congress/President is spending money in the wrong
areas/not spending money on the right things
840  SIZE OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT: the (large) size of
government/civil service/bureaucracy; the number
of government departments/employees/programs
853  POWER OF CONGRESS--general reference
856  POWER OF THE SUPREME COURT, all other references
to the Supreme Court except 857, 858
859  Other specific references to the (federal) balance
of power; legislative gridlock in Washington
862  FAIR ELECTION PROCEDURES; prevention of vote
manipulation; curbing of political "bosses", smear
campaigns
869  Other specific references to problems of
representation; term limitations for members of
Congress
874  Lack of support for the President; any
anti-President comments, negative reference to the
PRESIDENT's quality, style, etc.
878  Mention of a specific CANDIDATE or relative of a
candidate -- NFS
881  New president/administration getting started;
other references specific to the President
885  PUBLIC APATHY/disinterest--all references
887  Extending/protecting EQUAL RIGHTS, basic freedoms,
human rights of all citizens
899  Other specific mention of problems relating to the
functioning of government

OTHER
1990-91: "There were no issues"; "there were no issues, just party politics"
1990-91: "There was no campaign in my district"
Other specific mentions of important problems
DK
INAP; No further mention; no problems

>> MASTER CODE
LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE CODE

GENERAL PHILOSOPHY
010 ACCEPTANCE OF CHANGE/new ideas; less bound to status quo, more open to new ideas/ways of doing things; flexible, innovative, "modern", progressive
110 RESISTANCE TO CHANGE/new ideas; stick to (protect) status quo, resist new ways of doing things; rigid, set in ways, old-fashioned

020 QUICK (RASH) RESPONSE to problems; tackle problems quickly; impetuous, impulsive, (too) aggressive, take more chances, not cautious (enough)
120 Slow (cautious) response to problems, do-nothing, lets things go, avoid risk

021 IRRESPONSIBLE; does not worry about consequences; "anything goes" attitude
121 THOUGHTFUL; worries about consequences

030 Independence of thought, ideas; think on their own; don't (always) follow party directives; outspoken activist, go-getters; look at both sides of question; more likely to compromise/give and take on an issue
130 Don't think independently; compliant, disciplined, follow party directives; look at only one side of issues

035 Consistent; takes firm stands; decisive; determined; stubborn
135 Inconsistent, they switch positions/do not take firm stand on issues; are indecisive

040 FOR EQUALITY, equal rights for everybody; "no 'stuffed shirts'"; talk on people's level; willing to listen to people, people like me
140 ELITIST; favors maintaining special privileges for some

050 EXTREME, RADICAL, far left (not further specified)
150 MODERATE, middle-of-road, less extreme (not further specified)
155 REACTIONARY, far right (not further specified)

060 Cares about giving to, helping others; compassionate; generous; do-gooder
160 Self-centered, cares primarily about self
anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
061    SENSITIVE TO SOCIAL PROBLEMS; concerned with social reform; interested in improving social conditions; for equalizing distribution of income
161    UNAWARE OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS; not favoring social reform; not interested in improving social conditions; against equalizing/redistribution of income
-----
070    Future-oriented, plan ahead, look to the future
170    Not future-oriented, don’t plan ahead, don’t worry about the future; short-sighted
-----
071    Idealist, not realistic about what is possible
171    Pragmatic; down to earth, realistic
-----
080    Socialistic, for welfare state, for social welfare programs, for government intervention in social problems; leaves less to (interferes more with) private enterprise
180    FOR FREE ENTERPRISE, capitalism, against socialism (code "help big business" under group references); for development of private enterprise, against government expansion into areas of private enterprise; against government intervention in social problems, leaves individuals to fend off on their own
-----
081    Depends (too much) on federal government (rather than state or local government); (TOO) CENTRALIZED, paternalism, want Washington to do everything
181    For states’ rights, local government, less interference from Washington at local level, against powerful federal government
-----
082    DESTROY PERSONAL INITIATIVE/individual responsibility/individual dignity; recognize individual needs government help
182    Initiative/Responsibility/Dignity of individual protected
-----
083    Humanistic; care (more) about people; for the benefit of the person
183    Less/Not humanistic; less/not concerned about people
-----
084    Patriotic, nationalist; looks out for good of our country; pride in government/country/Constitution; has the country’s interest at heart
184    Less patriotic, less nationalistic; not enough pride in government/country/Constitution; willing to take care of other people (e.g., refugees) before taking care of people at home
-----
085    Definite moral standards/stands; concern for/control of public morality
185    Freedom to do as one chooses; less interested in strict control of social behavior; not interested in setting moral standards
086 (Good) Christian; strong religious beliefs
186 Not religious

087 Adhere to/uphold/respect the Constitution; live up to/stick to what the Constitution says
187 Deviate from/ignore/don't respect the Constitution; interpret the Constitution to suit their needs; ignore the Constitution when it suits their purposes

088 Support/uphold/defend the Bill of Rights; protect the right to freedom of speech/press/religion, etc.; support the ACLU
188 Seek to curtail/fail to protect/unwilling to observe the Bill of Rights; willing to put limits in freedom of speech/press/religion, etc.; doesn't support the ACLU

General Philosophy (continued)

089 (More) Concerned about HUMAN RIGHTS; places (greater) importance on the protection of human rights.
189 Less/not concerned about HUMAN RIGHTS; does not place/places less importance on the protection of human rights.

090 Other general philosophy reference pertaining to liberals
190 Other general philosophy reference pertaining to conservatives

FISCAL AND ECONOMIC POLICY REFERENCES
- Fiscal Policy--Easy Spending Responses
  400 SPEND MORE FREELY/high spenders (NFS); liberal economic policy; favor government spending
  401 Spend much relative to what is accomplished, WASTEFUL, not careful with spending
  402 Spend much relative to money available; SPEND US DEEPER IN DEBT
  403 Spend under special circumstances, such as hard times
  404 Bring cheap money, MORE MONEY CIRCULATING
  405 Other easy spending responses
  406 Want to RAISE TAXES--NFS; want to keep taxes high/increase government revenues
  407 Will increase INCOME TAXES; will not cut income taxes; will rely on increase in/high income tax to provide government revenues

- Fiscal Policy--Cautious Spending Responses
  500 Spend less freely, economize in government (NFS); tight economic policy; oppose government spending
  501 Spend little relative to what is accomplished, LESS WASTEFUL/more careful with government (taxpayers') money
  502 Spend little relative to money available, REDUCE DEBT; keep debt from getting higher, balanced budget
  503 Spend little even when special circumstances might warrant
  504 FOR SOUND MONEY, tight money, deflation
Other cautious spending responses

Want to CUT TAXES—NFS; want to keep taxes low/decrease government revenues

Will cut INCOME TAXES; will not increase income taxes; will rely on taxes other than income tax to provide government revenue

Favor (too much) GOVERNMENT CONTROL OVER ECONOMY; doesn't let business get more involved/handle problems of poverty/unemployment, etc.

Don't favor (too much) government control over economy; LETS BUSINESS GET MORE INVOLVED/handle problems of poverty/unemployment, etc.

Other reference to fiscal and economic policy

Propose/enact FAIR TAXES; believe everyone should be taxed the same/that taxes should be even-handed

Propose/enact UNFAIR TAXES; show favoritism/give tax breaks to certain groups or types of people

Give tax breaks to the poor/working/middle class people; tax policies favor the lower/middle classes

Give tax breaks to the wealthy/corporations; tax policies favor the rich/powerful/upper classes

SPECIFIC DOMESTIC POLICIES FAVORED BY LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE

MINIMUM WAGE LEGISLATION; favors raising minimum wage, or favors raising unemployment compensation

SOCIAL SECURITY, government pension rates

FULL EMPLOYMENT policies; government commitment to provide a job for everyone who wants to work

MEDICAL (HEALTH) INSURANCE, medical care for the aged, socialized medicine, Medicare

Government control of UTILITIES, more attention to conservation; public works, mention of ecology, environment

Federal AID TO EDUCATION/school-building, teachers' pay higher

Busing; forced integration

Other federal control of education or schools response

Prayer in schools

CIVIL RIGHTS, insist more strongly on civil rights

Law and order—hard line (or NA line); want a police state; support death penalty (88)

Law and order—soft line; oppose death penalty (88)

Property rights, OPEN HOUSING

Policies which would divide country, have civil war, race war

Higher TARIFFS, less free trade

"Wet" legislation, ANTI-PROHIBITION

General mention of social welfare, "give-away programs"

POVERTY program

EMPLOYMENT (job) training programs, job corps, etc.

Food stamps

Provides for/support/spend (more) for child care or parental leave policy; license/fund day care facilities

ABORTION policy

ABORTION; birth control

Women's rights; ERA
683    Legalization of pot, lower penalties/lenient drug laws or enforcement
684    Gay rights, homosexuals
685    Nuclear power, construction of nuclear plants
686    Gun control
690    Other specific domestic policy favored

SPECIFIC DOMESTIC POLICIES OPPOSED BY LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE
700    MINIMUM WAGE or unemployment compensation; won't raise minimum wage, won't improve unemployment compensation
701    SOCIAL SECURITY, against raising benefits
703    FULL EMPLOYMENT policies; government commitment to provide a job for everyone who wants to work
710    MEDICAL (HEALTH) INSURANCE, against medical care for the aged, against socialized medicine, Medicare
720    Government control of UTILITIES, for private power; less interested in conservation; public works, mention of ecology, environment
730    FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION; against or drag feet on aid to education
731    BUSING; forced integration
732    Other federal control of education or schools response
733    Prayer in schools
740    CIVIL RIGHTS, against or drag feet on civil rights legislation, leave it to states
741    Following a tough or hard line in maintenance of law and order; POLICE STATE; PREVENTION OF CRIME, etc.; imposing the death penalty (88)
742    Following a soft line in maintenance of law and order; POLICE STATE; PREVENTION OF CRIME, etc.; imposing the death penalty (88)
743    Property rights, OPEN HOUSING
744    Policies which would divide country, have civil war, race war; want to unite the country
750    HIGH TARIFFS, want free trade
760    Repeal; WANT PROHIBITION; "dry"
770    General mention of social welfare, "give-away programs"
771    POVERTY program
772    EMPLOYMENT (job) training programs, job corps
773    Food stamps
774    Provide for/support/spend (more) for CHILD CARE or parental leave policy; license/fund day care facilities
780    FARM policy
781    ABORTION; birth control
782    Women's rights; ERA
783    Legalization of pot, lower penalties/lenient drug laws
784    Gay rights, homosexuals
785    Nuclear power, construction of nuclear plants
786    Gun control
790    Other domestic policy opposed

GROUP REFERENCES
- Liberal/Conservative Good For/Helps/Gives Special Advantage To:
200    EVERYBODY; NOBODY; no catering to special
interests, "people" (the majority)
210 WORKING OR LITTLE PEOPLE, the common (poor, lowly) people, the working class, "average man"
212 People like me, people like us
220 Unions, "LABOR", labor leaders
230 BIG BUSINESS, industry, "business(men)", Wall Street (except small businessman, code 240)
231 Rich people, UPPER CLASSES, wealthy (powerful) people
240 SMALL BUSINESSMEN
250 MIDDLE CLASS PEOPLE, white collar people
260 FARMERS
270 BLACKS
280 Other racial and ethnic groups
281 THE SOUTH, some portion of the south
282 THE NORTH, some portion of the north
283 WHITE PEOPLE, white people only
284 MINORITIES, minority groups (NA which)
285 OLD PEOPLE
286 The educated, INTELLECTUALS, students
290 Other groups
299 Group reference codeable in 200 or 300 series, NA which

- Liberal/Conservative Bad For/Anti/Seeps In Check/Puts In Place:
300 Divisive, SETS CLASS AGAINST CLASS, caters to special interests (NA what), plays group politics; not for all the people; (LIBS/CONS) only for themselves
310 WORKING OR LITTLE PEOPLE, the common (poor, lowly) people, the working class, "average man"
312 PEOPLE LIKE ME, people like us
320 Unions, "LABOR", labor leaders
330 BIG BUSINESS, industry, "business(men)", Wall Street (except small businessman, code 340)
331 Rich people, UPPER CLASSES, wealthy (powerful) people
340 SMALL BUSINESSMEN
350 MIDDLE CLASS PEOPLE, white collar people
360 FARMERS
370 BLACKS
371 Racist, prejudiced, bigoted
380 Other racial and ethnic groups; "minority groups," other or NFS
381 THE SOUTH, some portion of the south
382 THE NORTH, some portion of the north
383 WHITE PEOPLE, white people only
384 MINORITIES, minority groups (NA which)
385 OLD PEOPLE
386 The educated, INTELLECTUALS, students
390 Other groups

FOREIGN POLICY REFERENCES
800 WAR; get us into war (faster);
liberal/conservative associated with war, military
810 PEACE; more likely to keep peace,
liberal/conservative associated with peace (no mention of Vietnam specifically)
820 Internationalist; MORE FOR FOREIGN AID/trade,
government activities abroad; cooperate with allies; U.N. "more for foreign aid/trade"
830 ISOLATIONIST; avoid foreign activities, cut foreign aid/trade (military or economic); "cut foreign aid/trade"
840 NATIONAL SECURITY; for strong national defense (spending); strong (firm) (too aggressive) posture toward communism (Russia); too much defense spending
850 INADEQUATE NATIONAL SECURITY; fail to maintain (spend for) defense; weak posture toward communism (Russia)
860 Specific trouble spots
870 Control of nuclear weapons
880 Strong foreign policy
881 Weak foreign policy
890 Other foreign policy--other substantive foreign policy mentions (direction of response usually indicated)
891 Mention of "foreign policy" difference, but no substance or direction given (e.g., usually response is "they differ on foreign policy or in how they will handle foreign policy")

MISCELLANEOUS
900 Other miscellaneous reference pertaining to liberals
901 Other miscellaneous reference pertaining to conservatives
902 Liberal defined in terms of specific national figure or Democratic party
903 Conservative defined in terms of specific national figure or Republican party
998 DK
999 NA
000 INAP

>> MASTER CODE

NATIONALITY AND ETHNICITY

North America
01 American Indian, tribal mentions
02 Canadian; not specified as French-Canadian (03)
03 Canadian, of French origin
04 Mexican (excluding explicit mention of "Chicano", "Mexican-American"
05 Central American

West Indies
07 Barbados
08 Cuban
09 Dominican Republic
10 Haitian
11 Jamaican
12 Puerto Rican
13 West Indian--not from one of the above countries
14 West Indian--NA which country

South America
16 South American--any country

EUROPE
British Isles
18 English, British
19 Irish (not specified as from Northern Ireland,
Ulster--22)
20    Scottish
21    Welsh
22    From Northern Ireland (Ulster)
23    Scot-Irish
24    From British Isles; from two or more countries of the British Isles -EUROPE (continued)

Western Europe
26    Austrian
27    Belgian
28    French
29    German; also Pennsylvania Dutch
30    Luxembourg
31    Netherlands, Holland; Dutch
32    Swiss
33    From Western Europe; two or more countries of Western Europe Scandinavia
35    Danish
36    Finn, Finnish
37    Norwegian
38    Swedish
39    Icelander
40    Scandinavian; reference to two or more Scandinavian countries
-------------------
41    REFERENCE TO TWO OR MORE COUNTRIES FROM COMBINATION

OF THE FOLLOWING AREAS: BRITISH ISLES, WESTERN EUROPE, SCANDINAVIA, MEDITERRANEAN COUNTRIES, GREECE

Eastern Europe
43    Czechoslovakian, Slavic
44    Estonian
45    Hungarian
46    Latvian
47    Lithuanian
48    Polish
49    Russian; from U.S.S.R.
50    Ukrainian
51    Eastern Europe; reference to two or more countries of Eastern Europe

Balkan Countries
53    Albanian
54    Bulgarian
55    Greek
56    Rumanian
57    Yugoslavian
58    Mention of two or more Balkan Countries

Mediterranean Countries
60    Italian
61    Portugese
62    Spanish
63    Maltese
-------------------
64    EUROPEAN; GENERAL MENTION OF EUROPE; REFERENCE TO TWO OR MORE EUROPEAN COUNTRIES OF EUROPE NOT CODEABLE ABOVE

ASIA (except Near East)
65    Pakistani
Afghan
Indian (not American Indian, code 01)
Southeast Asia--from Indochina, Thailand, Malaya, Burma, Philippines, Indonesia
Chinese
Japanese; Japanese American
Korean
{}
Egyptian
Iranian, Persian
Iraqi
Israeli
Jordanian
Lebanese
Arab, Arabian, Saudi Arabian
Syrian
Turk, Turkish
Armenian
African; from any African country excluding only Egypt (U.A.R.); South African (formerly 90)
Australian, New Zealander, Tasmanian
White, Caucasian
Black; Negro; American Black; African American
Chicano; Mexican-American; Hispanic; Latin American
NEITHER
Catholic
Protestant
Jewish
Mormon
Other religious groups
Other group; combinations not codeable above
DK
NA

>> MASTER CODE
PARTY-CANDIDATE

PARTY ONLY -- PEOPLE WITHIN PARTY

Johnson
Kennedy, John; JFK
Kennedy, Robert; RFK
Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"
Kennedy, NA which
Truman
Roosevelt; "FDR"
McGovern
Carter
Mondale
McCarthy, Eugene
Humphrey
Muskie
Dukakis, Michael
Wallace
Jackson, Jesse
Clinton, Bill
Clinton, Hillary
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0031 Eisenhower; Ike
0032 Nixon
0034 Rockefeller
0035 Reagan
0036 Ford
0037 Bush
0038 Connally
0039 Kissinger
0040 McCarthy, Joseph
0041 Buchanan, Pat
0051 Other national party figures (Senators, Congressman, etc.)
0052 Local party figures (city, state, etc.)
0053 Good/Young/Experienced leaders; like whole ticket
0054 Bad/Old/Inexperienced leaders; dislike whole ticket
0055 Reference to vice-presidential candidate
0097 Other people within party reasons

PARTY ONLY -- PARTY CHARACTERISTICS
0101 Traditional Democratic voter: always been a Democrat; just a Democrat; never been a Republican; just couldn't vote Republican
0102 Traditional Republican voter: always been a Republican; just a Republican; never been a Democrat; just couldn't vote Democratic
0111 Positive, personal, affective terms applied to party--good/nice people; patriotic; etc.
0112 Negative, personal, affective terms applied to party--bad/lazy people; lack of patriotism; etc.
0121 Can trust them; they keep their promises; you know where they stand
0122 Can't trust them; they break their promises; you don't know where they stand
0131 Party is well-organized, sticks together, is united; members are disciplined; votes party line
0132 Party is poorly-organized/really two parties/divided/ factionalized; members not disciplined; doesn't vote party line
0133 Party is (more) representative/good cross-section of the country; encompasses a wider variety of views/people; is more at the center of the country's views
0134 Party is less/not representative; bad cross-section of the country; encompasses more restricted views; is less at the center of the country's views
0135 Reference to participation of minority/women candidate(s)
0141 Reference to party's most recent National Convention; party's process/method of selecting presidential/vice-presidential candidates
0151 Performance of local branch of party; how they've done in this state/county/town
0161 Reference to the predominant faction that R sees as being in control of the party (NA which faction); "I don't like the people running it"
0162 Reference to Northerners/Liberals (as in control) of Democratic Party
0163 Reference to Southerners/Conservatives (as in control) of Democratic Party
0164    Reference to Easterners/Liberals/Moderates (as in
control) of Republican Party
0165    Reference to Midwesterners/Westerners/Southerners/
Conservatives (as in control) of Republican Party
0167    Can't win; doesn't have a chance
0168    Can win; party can't be beat
0169    Too big a party; there are too many of them; party
is too powerful
0170    Too small a party; there are not enough of them;
party is too weak
0171    Listens (more) to people; takes (more) into
consideration the needs and wants of people;
understands (better) the people/the majority of
the people
0172    Doesn't listen to/understand the needs and wants of
the people/the majority of the people
0173    Campaign tactics, uses too much money in campaigns,
slings mud
0174    Party has been in office/controlled Congress/held
the White House too long/long enough; we need a
change (of party) [code 430 for mentions of
candidate]
0197    Other party-characteristic reasons

CANDIDATE ONLY -- EXPERIENCE, ABILITY
0201    General reference to him as "a good/bad man or a
good/bad guy"; R has heard good/bad things about
him; qualifications; general ability; reference to
his "personality"
0203    Not qualified for the office; the job is too big
for him to handle
0211    Experienced (NA what kind) (see 0217, 0218, 0220
for specific kinds of experience; if in foreign
policy see 1100's)
0212    Inexperienced
0213    Dependable/Trustworthy/Reliable; a man you can
trust with the responsibilities of government
("trust" in the capability sense, rather than the
honesty sense)
0214    Undependable/Untrustworthy/Unreliable; a man you
can't trust with the responsibilities of
government
0215    A military man; a good military/war record
0216    Not a military man; bad military/war record; no
military/war record
0217    His record in public service; how well he's
performed in previous offices; voting record in
Congress
0218    Has government experience/political
experience/seniority/ incumbency
0219    Lacks government experience/political experience
0220    A statesman; has experience in foreign affairs
0221    Not a statesman; lacks experience in foreign
affairs
0222    "He has done a good job so far"; he has brought us
through hard times"; has gotten things done has
some good ideas; trying to do right things
0223    Hasn't done anything; hasn't produced any results
(general); has not been able to get programs off
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0224</td>
<td>Has fulfilled/Sept (campaign) promises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0225</td>
<td>Has not fulfilled/Sept (campaign) promises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0297</td>
<td>Other candidate experience/ability reasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0301</td>
<td>Dignified/has dignity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0302</td>
<td>Undignified/lacks dignity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0303</td>
<td>Strong/decisive/self-confident/aggressive; will end all this indecision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0304</td>
<td>Weak/indecisive/lacks self-confidence/vacillating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0305</td>
<td>Inspiring; a man you can follow; &quot;a leader&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0306</td>
<td>Uninspiring; not a man you can follow; not a leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0335</td>
<td>Makes people feel good about America/being Americans; is patriotic/loves the country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0307</td>
<td>People have confidence in him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0308</td>
<td>People don't have confidence in him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0309</td>
<td>Good at communicating with blacks, young people, other &quot;problem&quot; groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0310</td>
<td>Bad at communicating with blacks, young people, other &quot;problem&quot; groups (if communicate in general, see 0441, 0442)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0311</td>
<td>Knows how to handle people (at personal level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0312</td>
<td>Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0313</td>
<td>A politician/political person; (too) much in politics; a good politician; part of Washington crowd; politically motivated; just wants to be re-elected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0314</td>
<td>Not a politician; not in politics; above politics; a bad politician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0315</td>
<td>Independent; no one runs him; his own boss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0316</td>
<td>Not independent; run by others; not his own man/boss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0317</td>
<td>Humble; knows his limitations; doesn't pretend to know all the answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0318</td>
<td>Not humble enough; too cocky/self-confident; can't admit shortcomings; blames others for his/her mistakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0319</td>
<td>(Too) Careful/Cautious/Good judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0320</td>
<td>(Too) Impulsive/Careless/Bad/Poor judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0334</td>
<td>Poor at explaining himself/his positions; doesn't answer questions clearly; speaks off the top of his head/doesn't stop to think before he speaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0321</td>
<td>Helps people in the district on a personal level; has helped R personally with a problem (specific mention); tries to do things for the people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0322</td>
<td>Doesn't help people in the district on a personal level; was not helpful to R with a personal problem (specific mention)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0323</td>
<td>Represents (well) the views of the district; close to people in the district; comes home regularly to chat and mix with people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0324</td>
<td>Does not represent (well) the views of the district; not close to the people in the district; doesn't interact enough with the people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0325</td>
<td>Keeps people well informed about governmental matters; communicates with constituents; any mention of R receiving newsletters or</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Page 306*
communications from him/her; explains matters well so people can understand

0326 Does not inform people enough about governmental matters; does not send enough newsletters or communications; doesn't explain matters well

0327 Listens to the people/solicits public opinion; any mention of polls or questionnaires; is accessible to constituents (NFS)

0328 Doesn't listen to the people/does not solicit public opinion; isn't accessible to constituents (NFS)

0329 Has helped local (district) economy; brought money, projects, jobs to district

0330 Has not helped local (district) economy; not brought money, projects, jobs to district

0331 Candidate helps the district; watches out for the interests of the district or region in general

0332 Candidate has not protected/watched out for the interests of the district (specific mentions)

*0334 Located after 0320

*0335 Located after 0306

0397 Other candidate leadership reason

CANDIDATE ONLY -- PERSONAL QUALITIES

0401 Honest/Sincere; keeps promises; man of integrity; means what he says; fair; not tricky; open and candid; straightforward; positive Playboy references (1976)

0402 Dishonest/Insincere; breaks promises; no integrity; doesn't mean what he says; tricky; not open and candid; not straightforward

0403 Man of high principles/ideals; high moral purpose; idealistic (if too idealistic, code 0416)

0404 Lacks principles/ideals

0405 Racist/Bigoted/Prejudiced

0406 Not a racist/bigoted/prejudiced

0407 Public servant; man of duty; conscientious; hard-working; would be a full-time President; good attendance record in Congress; dedicated; really interested in serving people

0408 Doesn't take public service seriously; lazy; would be a part-time President; poor attendance record in office; not dedicated; not really interested in serving people

0409 Doesn't use office for personal benefit; not in office to maximize personal benefit

0410 Uses/in office (mostly) for personal benefits (junket trips, big salary, other perks)

0411 Patriotic; (88) like Bush's stand on Pledge of Allegiance issue

0412 Unpatriotic; (88) dislike Dukakis' stand on Pledge of Allegiance issue

0413 Understands the nation's/district's problems; well-informed; studies up on issues

0414 Doesn't understand the nation's/district's problems; poorly informed; doesn't study up on issues

0415 Realistic

0416 Unrealistic; too idealistic; (if "idealistic" in Page 307
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0417</td>
<td>Uses common sense; makes a lot of sense; pragmatic/practical/down-to-earth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0418</td>
<td>Not sensible; impractical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0419</td>
<td>(Too) well educated; scholarly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0420</td>
<td>Poorly educated; unschooled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0421</td>
<td>Intelligent/Smart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0422</td>
<td>Unintelligent/Stupid/Dumb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0423</td>
<td>Religious; &quot;moral&quot; (in religious sense); God-fearing; &quot;too&quot; religious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0424</td>
<td>&quot;Irreligious&quot;; &quot;immoral&quot; (in religious sense); Playboy interview (reflects on Carter--1976)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0425</td>
<td>Self-made; not well off; started out as poor; worked his way up; (started out) unpolished/unrefined/rough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0426</td>
<td>Wealthy; rich; born with silver spoon in mouth; polished/refined/well-mannered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0427</td>
<td>Old hat; has run before; a die-hard; &quot;a loser&quot; (in the past)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0428</td>
<td>Someone new; a fresh face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0429</td>
<td>Don't change horses in midstream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0430</td>
<td>Time for a change; incumbent has been in office too long/long enough [code 174 for mentions of party]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0431</td>
<td>Unsafe/Unstable; dictatorial; craves power; ruthless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0432</td>
<td>Safe/Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0433</td>
<td>Sense of humor; jokes a lot (too much)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0434</td>
<td>No sense of humor; humorless (too serious)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0435</td>
<td>Kind/Warm/Gentle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0436</td>
<td>Cold/Aloof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0437</td>
<td>Likeable; gets along with people; friendly; outgoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0438</td>
<td>Not likeable; can't get along with people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0439</td>
<td>Democratic (in non-partisan sense)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0440</td>
<td>Undemocratic (in non-partisan sense)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0441</td>
<td>High-fallutin'/High-brow; talks in circles; can't talk to common man; can't communicate ideas well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0442</td>
<td>Not high-fallutin'/is low-brow; talks straight; can talk to common man; can communicate ideas well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0443</td>
<td>Well-known; &quot;I know him/her&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0444</td>
<td>Unknown; not well known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0445</td>
<td>Reference to his family (not 0457)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0446</td>
<td>Reference to his wife/spouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0447</td>
<td>Speaking ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0448</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0449</td>
<td>Appearance/Looks/Face/Appearance on TV; his smile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0450</td>
<td>Age (NA how perceived)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0451</td>
<td>(Too) Old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0452</td>
<td>(Too) Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0453</td>
<td>Mature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0454</td>
<td>Immature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0455</td>
<td>Regional reference; &quot;he's a Southerner&quot;; &quot;he's a Midwesterner&quot;; he comes from the country/a rural area; area reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0456</td>
<td>Previous occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0457</td>
<td>He's a family man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0459</td>
<td>Energetic; too energetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0460</td>
<td>Not energetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0461</td>
<td>Gender, e.g., &quot;She's a woman&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0462</td>
<td>Racial/Ethnic attribute; &quot;He is a black man&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0464</td>
<td>Located after 0422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0495</td>
<td>Other negative personal qualities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0496</td>
<td>Other positive personal qualities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0497</td>
<td>Other candidate personal qualities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0498</td>
<td>References to Playboy interview—NA direction or neutral; &quot;it's OK,&quot; &quot;that is what the Bible says&quot;, (not 0401)—1976</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CANDIDATE ONLY—PARTY CONNECTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0500</td>
<td>A Democrat; good Democrat; typical Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0501</td>
<td>A Republican; good Republican; typical Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0502</td>
<td>Controlled by party regulars/bosses/machine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0503</td>
<td>Not controlled by party regulars/bosses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0504</td>
<td>Reference to men around him/staff/followers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0505</td>
<td>Reference to his speeches (exc. 0447), campaign tactics; mud-slinging; (88) dislike Bush's stand on Pledge of Allegiance issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0506</td>
<td>Can win; best choice for party victory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0507</td>
<td>Cannot win; not good choice for party victory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0508</td>
<td>Reference to linkage with other party figures (he's close to the Kennedy's; he was close to Eisenhower; etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0509</td>
<td>Would continue/Seep/follow Democratic policies (unspecified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0510</td>
<td>Would change/get rid of &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0511</td>
<td>Would continue/Seep/follow Democratic domestic policies (unspecified, not codeable in 0900's)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0512</td>
<td>Would change/get rid of &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0513</td>
<td>Would continue/Seep/follow Democratic foreign policies (unspecified, not codeable in 1100's)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0514</td>
<td>Would change/get rid of &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0515</td>
<td>Would continue/Seep/follow Republican policies (unspecified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0516</td>
<td>Would change/get rid of &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0517</td>
<td>Would continue/Seep/follow Republican domestic policies (unspecified, not codeable in 0900's)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0518</td>
<td>Would change/get rid of &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0519</td>
<td>Would continue/Seep/follow Republican foreign policies (unspecified, not codeable in 1100's)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0520</td>
<td>Would change/get rid of &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0531</td>
<td>More liberal than most Democrats; a Northern Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0532</td>
<td>More conservative &quot; &quot; ; a Southern Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0533</td>
<td>More liberal than most Republicans; an Eastern Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0534</td>
<td>More conservative &quot; &quot; ; a Midwestern/Western/ Southern Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0535</td>
<td>Will bring in/listen to the (party) liberals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0536</td>
<td>Will bring in/listen to the (party) conservatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0541</td>
<td>References to the physical or mental health of vice-presidential incumbent/candidate; emotional state/stability of vice-presidential incumbent/candidate; [1972] References to the Eagleton affair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0542 Reference to vice-presidential incumbent/candidate, running mate - NEC
0543 References to age/gender/race/ethnic background of vice-presidential incumbent/candidate; [1984] Mondale's selection of a woman for vice-president
0544 Mention of issue(s) that vice-presidential incumbent/candidate is identified with or has taken a leading role in promoting; [1992] Gore's position on the environment
0551 References to link with "Watergate"--positive reference to Watergate
0552 Not associated with "Watergate"--negative reference to Watergate; making too much out of Watergate
0553 Ford's pardon of Nixon--NA direction or against pardon
0554 " --pro; brave/right thing to do
0555 Positive references about independent candidacy; maybe the country needs a third party; third parties should have more recognition; the two party system needs buckling
0556 Negative references/liabilities related to independent candidacy; "he's an independent" (NFS); "we don't need a third party"; "he lacks backing from a party"
0597 Other candidate party connection reasons

PARTY OR CANDIDATE--GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT
0601 Good/Efficient/Businesslike administration; balanced budget; lower/wouldn't increase national debt; cautious spending
0602 Bad/Inefficient/Unbusinesslike administration; wasteful; "bureaucratic"; deficit budget; higher/increased national debt; overspend
0603 Honest government; not corrupt; no "mess in Washington"
0604 Dishonest/Corrupt government; "mess in Washington"; immorality in government; reference to Hayes, Mills, Lance; [1992] writing bad checks on the House of Representatives bank
0605 (Would) Spend less (than other side); (would) spend too little
0606 (Would) Spend more (than other side); (would) spend too much
0607 Has brought/will bring about bureaucratic reform
0608 Has not brought/will not bring about bureaucratic reform
0609 General assessment of job he/they would do/are doing; is good/bad President; are providing good/bad administration
0622 Doesn't work (hard) at job; not involved (enough) in the work of his office/delegates too much authority to others; has chosen poor/incompetent aides; his aides have not performed well
0610 Reference to management/performance in Congress/Supreme Court/other government agency; references to the quality of appointments made to public posts (courts, cabinet, commissions)
0611 He has/has not worked well with (Democratic) Congress; would/could have done better with...
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(Republican) Congress; he kept/would keep Congress in check

0612  He will work well/better with (Democratic) Congress
0613  Gets more done/accomplishes as much/more productive
0614  Gets less done/doesn't accomplish as much/less productive

*0625  Mostly approve of/happy with job done so far, but doesn't approve of everything that has been done

0615  Sympathy/understanding expressed for the complexity/magnitude of the job (e.g., President): tough job
0616  Sympathy/understanding expressed for the difficult situation ("a mess") inherited by the incumbent

*0623  Doing the best he can (under the circumstances); doing as good a job as anyone else could do; everyone makes some mistakes
0617  Will face (difficult) issues; faces problems directly; faces up to political reality
0618  Will not face (difficult) issues; will not face problems directly; ignores political reality
0619  Supports the president/works well with the president/would work well with the president
0620  Does not support the president/does not (would not) work well with the president

0621  Response to/handling of domestic crisis or natural disaster - riot, hurricane, tornado, earthquake, flood, etc.

*0622  Located after 0609
*0623  Located after 0616
*0625  Located after 0614

0624  Opposes term limitations for Congress
0626  Favors term limitations for Congress

0627  The economy is bad, but that is not (necessarily) his fault

0628  [1994] Contract with America that was proposed by Republicans; support/commitment/opposition to

Contract with America

PARTY OR CANDIDATE--MISCELLANEOUS

0701  Just like him/them (NA why); like everything about him/them; "I was hoping he would win the (nomination/primaries)"

0702  Just dislike/Don't like him/them (NA why); don't like anything about him/them

*0732  Used to like him but don't now; have lost respect for him

0703  Will save America; America needs him/them
0704  Will ruin America; last thing America needs
0705  Will unite Americans/bring people together
0706  Will divide Americans/drive people apart
0707  Speaks of party/candidate as good protector(s); will know what to do; more intelligent
0708  Speaks of party/candidate as bad protector(s); won't know what to do

0709  Good for country (unspecified); trying to do good job; trying; not just out for self/own best interest; has/have country's interest at heart
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Bad for country (unspecified); don't have country's interests at heart; only looking out for their own interests

Lesser of two evils

Treatment of Jesse Jackson; didn't offer him the vice-presidential nomination; didn't use him (effectively) to get out the Black vote; weren't courteous/respectful toward him; didn't keep promises made to him

References to damaging incidents in candidate's personal life (sexual escapades, financial problems, substance abuse, etc); [1980] Reference to Chappaquidic; Kennedy's personal problems

Reference to Watergate affair (exc. 0551-0554)

The way the incumbent came to office; the people should select President

The incumbent should have a chance (on his own)/another chance/second chance

(I believe in/Necessary for) a two-party system; choice between candidates; opposition; balances power of other party

Vote for the man rather than party; look for more qualified man; don't pay attention to parties

The opponent who the candidate ran against; the candidate was the better/worse of the two in general; the candidate ran against someone I really like/dislike

Splits votes; will elect wrong candidate; "spoiler"

Expression of sympathy/admiration for the candidate's underdog position; trying hard against terrible odds; courageous uphill battle; "I like underdogs"; "they are bucking the guy" (keeping him off ballot, not taking him seriously, not giving him enough publicity)

Negative comments about the candidate's switching parties, being a turncoat, disloyal to his original party

Party selection of a woman for vice-president

Mention of debates; candidate's performance in the debates

Position (vote) on increasing congressional salary; position (vote) on accepting honoraria/outside pay/royalties while in office

Located after 0702

References to candidate's children or extended family [code 446 for references to spouse]

References to unfair/undeserved/excessive criticism by media or public

Other miscellaneous reasons: Other miscellaneous reasons relating to image and candidate/party effect on nation

General assessment of ideas/policies/stands (unspecified)

Different from other party/candidate

Same as other party/candidate; not different enough

(Too) negative; always tearing down other side; no solutions of his/their own
For government activity; believe government should take care of things; for big government; supports social programs/ spending (not 0905-0907)
Against government activity; believe government involved in too many things; favors reduction in social programs/ spending (not 0905-0907)
Humanistic; favor human beings over property rights
Not humanistic; favor property rights over human beings
Favor social change/reform/progress/improvement of social conditions
Against social change/reform/progress/improvement of social conditions
Socialistic
Anti-socialistic
Communist/soft/hard-liner on Communism/apologist for Communists/dupe
(Too) anti-communist/hard-liner on Communism
(Too) liberal (except 0531 or 0533)
(Too) conservative (except 0532 or 0534)
Moderate/middle of the road/for slow change; not an extremist/fanatic
Extremist/fanatic/too far out; not too moderate/not a fence-sitter
Pro-Far Right/Birchers/reactionaries; encouraging fascist/ police state
Anti-Far Right/    ; discouraging    
Pro-Far Left/radicals/Yippies/SDS; encouraging anarchy/ guerilla state
Anti-Far Left/      ; discouraging    
Pro-Extremists (NA direction)/nuts/bomb-throwers
Anti-Extremists    
Pro-States'/local/community rights; better local government
Anti-    
For equality; believe everyone should have things equally/ be treated equally
Anti-equality; believe some people should have more than others/people should not be treated equally
Generous, compassionate, believe in helping others
Selfish, only help themselves
Acceptance of change/new ideas; less bound to status quo; more open to new ideas/ways of doing things; flexible, innovative
Resistance to change/new ideas; stick to (protect) status quo; resist new ways of doing things; rigid
Has a well-defined set of beliefs/definite philosophy; does not compromise on principles; has (clear) understanding of goals they stand for
Has poorly defined set of beliefs; lacks a definite philosophy; compromise on principles; has no (clear) understanding of goals they stand for
Favor work ethic; believes in self-reliance/in people working hard to get ahead
Don't favor work ethic; believes in people being handed things/in government handouts (if specific policy mentioned, code in 0900's)
Keep track of/control over administration heads,
0842 Don't (as in 0841)
0843 Conditional evaluation: R suggests candidate/party cannot solve problems because not under his/their control (no negative connotations); will he/they be able to do what they say (determining factor outside his/their control); "I like what he says but wonder if he can do it" (if clearly negative, code in 0122 or 0402)
0845 Will involve/wants to involve people/Congress/Cabinet/advisors/other government officials in government/decision making
0846 Will not involve people/Congress/Cabinet/advisors/other government officials in government/decision making
0847 Separation of church and state/religion and politics--pro
0848 Separation of church and state/religion and politics--anti
0849 Stand/views on religion (church/state relationship NA)
0897 Other Government Activity/Philosophy reasons

PARTY OR CANDIDATE--DOMESTIC POLICIES

0900 General assessment of domestic ideas/policies/stands (unspecified)
0901 General assessment of economic policy (unspecified)
0902 Government economic controls--NA direction
0903 " " " --Pro; we need planned economy; control of private enterprise
0904 " " " --Anti; we have too much interference in private enterprise
0905 Welfare/Poverty problems--NA direction; give-away
0906 " " " --Pro government aid/activity; pro give-aways
0907 " " " --Anti government aid/activity; anti give-aways; pro self-help
0908 Social Security/Pensions--NA direction
0909 " " " --Pro expansion in coverage and/or increase in benefits
0910 " " " --Anti expansion in coverage and/or increase in benefits; favoring contraction and/or decrease
0911 Unemployment compensation--NA direction
0912 " " " --Pro expansion in coverage and/or increase in benefits
0913 " " " --Anti expansion in coverage and/or increase in benefits; favoring contraction and/or decrease
0914 Aid to education--NA direction
0915 " " " --Pro
0916 " " " --Anti
0917 Aid to parochial schools--NA direction
0918 " " " --Pro
0919 " " " --Anti
1052 School choice plans; vouchers -- pro
1053 " " " -- anti
1047 Establish/enforce standards for schools (test
teachers, require minimum curricula, regulate
class size, etc) -- NA direction
*1048 " " " -- Pro
*1049 " " " -- Anti
0920 Housing--NA direction
0921 " --Pro more public housing
0922 " -- Anti more public housing
0923 Aid/Programs for older people/the aged, Medicare,
Medicaid, direction -- NA
0924 " " " -- Pro
0925 " " " -- Anti
0926 Monetary policy--NA direction
0927 " " -- Pro loose(r) money; more availability of
loans for housing, cars, etc.; lower
interest rates
0928 " " -- Anti loose(r) money; for tighter money;
less availability of loans; higher
interest rates
*1054 Value of the dollar relative to gold/other
currencies; any mentions of gold/currencies
*1046 Solvency/stability/regulation/control of the
nation's FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS. [1990]
Involvement in the Savings and Loan scandals
0929 Tax policy--NA direction
0930 " " -- Pro lower taxes
0931 " " -- Anti lower taxes; for higher taxes
0932 " " -- Pro reform/fairer system/end of
loopholes/write-offs/dodges
0933 " " -- Anti reform/fairer system/end of
loopholes/write-offs/dodges
*1055 Line item veto -- pro
*1056 Line item veto -- anti
0942 [1990] Candidate voted for the budget agreement
which resulted in increased taxes/fees
0934 "The Times"/General conditions/Prosperity/The
Economy -- better under him/them
0935 " " -- worse under him/them
0936 Inflation/Cost of living--lower/better under
him/them
0937 " " -- higher/worse under him/them
0938 Wages/Salaries/Income/Employment--higher/better
under him/them
0939 " " -- lower/worse under him/them
0940 Prices for producers--higher/better under him/them
0941 " " -- lower/worse (if farm, see 0943-0945)
0942 Located after 0933
0943 Programs to help farmers -- NA direction
0944 " " -- Pro (greater) help/fairer
system, reform in system; higher
price supports
0945 " " -- Anti (greater) help/fairer
system, reform in system; higher
price supports
0946 Civil rights/Racial
justice/Integration/Desegregation/Voting Rights --
NA direction
0947 " " -- Pro
0948 " " -- Anti
*1043 Affirmative Action programs -- NA direction
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*1044    "    "    "    -- Pro; favors quotas based on race or gender
*1045    "    "    "    -- Anti; opposes quotas based on race or gender

0949    Civil liberties/Freedom of expression/First amendment/Privacy -- NA direction
0950    "    -- Pro; against snooping; political trials, etc; (88) like Dukakis' stand on Pledge of Allegiance issue
0951    "    -- Anti; for snooping; political trials; McCarthyite; (88) dislike Republican party stand on Pledge of Allegiance issue
0952    General assessment of Labor policy (unspecified)
0953    Right to work laws--NA direction
0954    "    "    "    --Pro (i.e., opposes unions [anti-labor, code 1208])
0955    "    "    "    --Anti (i.e., supports unions [pro-labor, code 1207])
0956    Strikes--NA direction
0957    "    --will have fewer/will handle better
0958    "    --will have more/will handle worse
0959    Public power/Utilities/TVA/Atomic reactors/Nuclear power plants/Etc. -- NA direction
0960    "    "    "    -- Pro
0961    "    "    "    -- Anti
*1059    Regulation of companies engaged in public communication or transportation -- pro
*1060    "    "    "    -- anti

0962    Ecology/Environment; Air and Water Pollution--NA direction
0963    Will crack down on polluters, will be activist; will protect the environment
0964    Won't crack down on polluters, doesn't care; in league with polluters; not willing to protect the environment
0965    Veterans' Benefits--NA direction
0966    "    "    "    --Pro expansion of coverage and/or increase in benefits
0967    "    "    "    --Anti expansion of coverage and/or increase in benefits; favoring contraction and/or decrease
0968    Law and order--NA direction
0969    "    "    "    --soft line--unspecified
0970    "    "    "    --blacks
0971    "    "    "    --campus demonstrators
0972    "    "    "    --criminals/organized crime/hoodlums/street crime
0973    "    "    "    --anti power of police; court interference
*1041    "    "    "    --opposes death penalty
0974    "    "    "    --hard line--unspecified
0975    "    "    "    --blacks
0976    "    "    "    --campus demonstrators
0977    "    "    "    --criminals/organized crime/hoodlums/street crime
0978    "    "    "    --pro power of police; reduced court interference
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1042 " " " " -- favors death penalty
0979 Public morality--NA direction
0980 " " -- Strict/older/traditionalistic outlook;
   improve/renew morality of country;
   pro-family; defends family values
0981 " " -- Permissive/newer/modernistic outlook;
   not (strongly enough) pro-family;
   doesn't defend (strongly enough) family
   values
0982 Drugs--NA direction
0983 " " -- Pro legalization/decriminalization;
   soft-liner; (88) doesn't support (strongly
   enough) the war on drugs; not willing to do
   more to combat drug use/pushers; involvement
   with Noreiga
0984 " " -- Anti legalization/decriminalization;
   hard-liner; (88) supports the war on drugs;
   willing to do more to combat drug use/
   pushers
0985 Abortion and birth control--NA direction
0986 " " " " -- Pro reform/legalization;
   new outlook
0987 " " " " -- Anti reform/legalization;
   traditional outlook
0988 Gun control--NA direction
0989 " " -- Pro; controls
0990 " " -- Anti; "everyone has the right to own a
   gun"
0991 Busing--NA direction
0992 " " -- Pro; against neighborhood school
0993 " " -- Anti; for neighborhood school
0994 Urban problem/Cities--NA direction
0995 " " " " -- Pro government aid/activity
0996 " " " " -- Anti government aid/activity
0997 Other domestic policy reasons
1001 National Health Insurance--NA direction
1002 " " " " -- Pro
1003 " " " " -- Anti
1004 Energy/Gas shortage--Development of alternative
   energy source, NA direction
1005 " " " " -- Pro development of alternative
   source, better/handled better;
   more fuel
1006 " " " " -- Anti development of alternative
   source, worse/handled worse;
   less fuel
References to nuclear energy should be coded in 0959.
Government plans to make more jobs--NA direction;
make-work programs; CETA; WPAL; CCA
1008 " " " " -- Pro
1009 " " " " -- Anti
1010 Confidence/Trust in government--NA direction
1011 " " " " -- Would handle better; restore
   confidence
1012 " " " " -- Would handle worse; cause
   loss of confidence
1013 ERA; Women's rights--NA direction
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Influx of political/economic refugees (Cubans, Haitians, Mexicans, etc.) --NA direction

School prayer--NA direction

Gay rights--NA direction

Health--NA direction: [1994] (Clinton's) National health care plan/program

Government programs/aid for mentally ill, disabled, handicapped: [1994] (Clinton's) National health care plan/program

Help to/improvement in a specific industry or occupation--NA direction

Space program--NA direction

Day care--NA direction

Family/maternity leave laws -- Pro

Spending on infrastructure (roads, bridges, etc) -- Pro

Polarization of classes/increasing gap between rich and poor--NA direction

Located after 0973
*Located after 0978
*Located after 0948
*Located after 0948
*Located after 0948
*Located after 0928
*Located after 0919
*Located after 0919
*Located after 0919
*Located after 0919
*Located after 1040
*Located after 1040
*Located after 0928
*Located after 0933
*Located after 0933
PARTY OR CANDIDATE--FOREIGN POLICIES
1101 General assessment of foreign ideas/policies/stands (unspecified)
1102 Foreign policies more clear-cut/decisive; less bungling
1103 Foreign policies less clear-cut/decisive; more bungling
1104 Internationalist/Interested in other countries' problems/Interested in world role/Pro-UN and allies; Meddling in other people's problems
1105 Isolationist/America First/Fortress America/Would meddle less in other people's problems
1106 Strong military position/Preparedness/Weapons systems/ Pentagon spending/Overkill; SDI ("Star Wars")
1107 Weak military position/Pentagon spending cutbacks/No overkill/Reduce armed forces; SDI ("Star Wars")
1108 Cold-war oriented; opposed detente; international Communist-fighter
1109 Against cold war/Wants thaw/Detente/Understanding with international communists (if NA whether international, code in 0813-0814)
1110 Military aid to allies--NA direction
1111 " " " " --Pro
1112 " " " " --Anti
1113 Economic aid/Foreign aid/AID/Non-military aid--NA direction
1114 " " " " " " " " --Pro
1115 " " " " " " " " --Anti
1116 Located after 1163
1117 " " "
1118 Mideast--NA direction; any references to oil embargo; boycott of companies dealing with Israel; [1992] References to involvement in Iraqgate/arming of Saddam Hussein
1119 " --handle better/more experience; positive comments about Arab-Israeli peace treaty
1120 " --handle worse/less experience; negative comments about Arab-Israeli peace treaty
1121 " --Pro-Israel/anti-Arabs
1122 " --Anti-Israel/pro-Arabs; wishy-washy on Israel
1123 Red China--NA direction
1124 " " --handle better/more experience/doing well, better
1125 " " --handle worse/less experience/doing poorly
1126 " " --pro understanding/thaw/detente/new relationships/ recognition/admission to UN
1127 " " --anti understanding/thaw/detente/new relationships/ recognition/admission to UN; defender of Formosa/ Chaing/Nationalists
1128 Russia--NA direction
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1129    " --handle better/more experience
1130    " --handle worse/less experience
1131    " --pro understanding/thaw/detente/broadening of relations; SALT II
1132    " --anti understanding/thaw/detente/broadening of relations; SALT II
1133    Eastern Europe--NA direction
1134    " " --handle better/more experience
1135    " " --handle worse/less experience
1136    " " --pro defense of Iron-Curtain countries
1137    " " --anti
1138    Western Europe -- NA direction
1139    " " -- handling relations with European Community/specific countries well (better)
1140    " " " " badly (worse)
1141    Latin America--NA direction
1142    " " --handle better/more experience
1143    " " --handle worse/less experience
1144    " " --pro-third world posture; reach understanding with Castro/Chile/neutrals; anti-colonialism/European powers; against Contra aid/pro-Sandinista
1145    " " --anti-third world posture; hard anti-communism/anti-revolutionary policy; pro-colonialism/European powers; pro Contra aid/anti-Sandinista
1146    Africa--NA direction
1147    " " --pro-third world posture; reach understanding with leftists/neutrals; anti-colonialism/European powers
1148    Asia/India--NA direction
1149    " " --pro India/Bangladesh
1150    " " --pro Pakistan
1151    Located after 1163
1152    " " " 
1153    Vietnam/Indochina/Southeast Asia--NA direction
1154    " " " " --better chance for peace
1155    " " " " --poorer chance for peace; failed to end war
1156    " " " " --pro military victory/preservation of Saigon regime
1157    " " " " --anti military victory/willing to sacrifice Thieu/Sy; favoring withdrawal
1158    " " " " --will bring policy change (unspecific)
1159    Trouble spots (not specifically coded)--would handle better (Panama, Afghanistan, Persian Gulf)
1160    " " " " --would handle worse
*1162 (88) The invasion of Grenada
*1153 Would raise American prestige
*1154 Would lower American prestige; not maintain American prestige
*1155 Would have better chance for peace (unspecified); not get us into trouble abroad
*1156 Would have poorer chance for peace (unspecified); get us into war/trouble abroad
1164 Tariffs--NA direction
1165 " --Pro free trade/reduce tariffs; would not protect US labor from foreign competition
1166 " --Anti free trade; for high tariffs; would protect US labor from foreign competition
*1196 Foreign trade/balance of payments deficit--any mention
1167 Trade with communists--NA direction
1168 " " --Pro
1169 " " --Anti
1170 Draft--NA direction
1171 " --Pro volunteer army/abolition of peacetime draft
1172 " --Anti volunteer army; for peacetime draft
1173 " --Pro amnesty/pardon
1174 " --Anti amnesty/draft dodgers/pardon
*1178 Amnesty--NA direction
1179 POW-MIA--Will get prisoners back, will not abandon them
1180 POW-MIA--Will not get prisoners back, will abandon them
1181 Secrecy/deception in U.S. foreign policy; shuttle diplomacy; Kissinger's foreign policy (1976) --NA direction
1182 " " " " --Pro
1183 " " " " --Anti
1184 Located after 1105
1185 Priorities in military/defense spending (not reduction or increase but allocation of existing defense budget--Pro
1186 Priorities in military/defense spending (not reduction or increase but allocation of existing defense budget--Anti
1187 Iranian crisis; American hostages (1980)/Arms sale (1986) -- NA direction
1188 " " " " --has handled well/would handle better
1189 " " " " --has handled poorly/would handle worse
1190 Nuclear freeze/Disarmament--NA direction
1191 " " " --Pro
1192 " " " --Anti
1193 Terrorism; dealings with terrorists; hostages (except 1187-1189) -- NA direction; (88) Page 321
Bombing of Libya

" " " " -- has handled/would handle better; (88) Bombing of Libya/handling of Khadafy
" " " " -- has handled/would handle worse; (88) Bombing of Libya/handling of Khadafy

*1196 Located after 1166
*1197 Other foreign policy reasons
*1198 Located after 1142
*1199 Iran-Contra affair--NFS (NA whether 1187 or 1198)

PARTY OR CANDIDATE--GROUP CONNECTIONS

1201 Special interests/Privileged people/Influential--Pro
1202 " " " " --Anti
1203 "People like me"--pro, NA whether 1205, 1206
1204 " " " --anti, " " " "
1205 Common man/People/Little people/Working people--Pro
1206 " " " --Anti
1207 Labor/Unions/Labor bosses/Racketeers--Pro
1208 " " " --Anti
1209 Big Business/Corporate rich/The rich individuals/People with power/Wall Street/Industry/Upper classes--Pro
1210 (Same as 1209) --Anti
1211 Small businessman--Pro
1212 " " --Anti
1213 White collar workers/Salaried people/Middle class--Pro
1214 " " --Anti
1215 Farmers/Country people--Pro
1216 " " --Anti
1217 Blacks/Black people/Negroes--Pro
1218 " " --Anti
1219 People on welfare/ADC mothers/"Chiselers"--Pro
1220 " " " --Anti
1221 Old people/Senior citizens--Pro
1222 " " " --Anti
1223 Young people/Sids/"Freaks"/Hippies--Pro
1224 " " " --Anti
1225 Women/Feminists/Womens Liberationists, "sexists"--Pro
1226 " " " " " --Anti
1227 Veterans/Servicemen--Pro
1228 " " --Anti
1229 Ethnic or racial group (exc. 1217-1218); Minority groups (NA composition--Pro
1230 " " --Anti
1231 Section of the country--Pro
1232 " " --Anti
1233 Poor people/needy people/the unemployed -- Pro
1234 " " --Anti
1235 Civil servants--Pro
1236 " " --Anti
1297 Other group connection reasons
*1300 Located after 1162
*1301 Located after 1137
*1302 Located after 1137
*1303 Located after 1137
EVENTS UNIQUE TO ONE CAMPAIGN

5001  [1992] Perot quit the race/is a quitter - NFS
5002  [1992] Because Perot quit the race he is not trustworthy/dependable/steadfast (enough); he let down his supporters
5003  [1992] Because Perot quit the race and then re-entered it he is indecisive/inconsistent/not stable (enough); mentions of re-entering the race after have left it - NFS
5004  [1992] Perot is not a serious candidate

MISSING DATA CODES

9001  R has been influenced by spouse
9002  R has been influenced by someone else
9996  Refused to say
9997  Other miscellaneous
9998  DK
9999  NA
0000  INAP

* Indicates code descriptions that are listed out-of-order.

>> MASTER CODE

PARTY DIFFERENCES

RESPONSES THAT REFER SPECIFICALLY TO THE CANDIDATES RATHER THAN PARTIES SHOULD BE CODED 910. However, if the candidates are referred to as leaders or representatives of the parties, the response should be coded with the appropriate code category.

BROAD PHILOSOPHY

- LIBERAL RESPONSES

  001  More LIBERAL, progressive--too far left
  010  ACCEPTANCE OF CHANGE/new ideas; less bound to status quo; more open to new ideas; new ways of doing things
  020  QUICK (RASH) RESPONSE TO PROBLEMS; tackle problems quickly; impetuous; impulsive; too aggressive; take more chances; not cautious enough
  030  More extreme, RADICAL (NFS)
  040  SOCIALISTIC; for welfare state; for social welfare programs; sensitive to social problems; leaves less to (interferes more with) private enterprise
  050  DEPENDS (TOO MUCH) ON FEDERAL GOVERNMENT (rather than state or local government); (too) centralized, paternalism; want Washington to do everything
  060  DESTROY PERSONAL INITIATIVE/individual responsibility/individual dignity; recognize individual needs government help
  070  FUTURE-ORIENTED; plan ahead; look to the future
  085  FREEDOM TO DO AS ONE CHOOSES; less interested in strict control of social behavior; not interested in moral standards
  086  Not religious; against prayer in school
  090  Other broad philosophy--liberal

- CONSERVATIVE RESPONSES
100 More CONSERVATIVE/reactionary; too far right
110 RESISTANCE TO CHANGE/NEW IDEAS; stick to (protect) status quo; traditionalists; resist new ways of doing things; rigid
120 SLOW (CAUTIOUS) RESPONSE TO PROBLEMS; DO-NOTHING; lets things go
130 Moderate; middle of road (NFS); less extreme
140 For FREE ENTERPRISE capitalism; against socialism (code "help big business" under group references); unaware of social problems; for development of private enterprise; against expansion of government activities into areas of private enterprise
150 FOR STATES' RIGHTS, local government; less interference from Washington at local level; against powerful federal government
160 INITIATIVE/responsibility/dignity of individual protected
170 NOT FUTURE-ORIENTED; don't plan ahead; don't worry about the future
185 DEFINITE MORAL STANDARDS/stands; concern for/control of public morality; upholds/fosters family values
186 (Good) Christian; strong religious beliefs; for prayer in school
190 Other broad philosophy--conservative

GROUP REFERENCES
- PARTY SEEN AS GOOD FOR, HELPING, GIVING SPECIAL ADVANTAGE TO:
  200 Everybody; nobody; no catering to special interests, "people" (the majority)
  210 WORKING OR LITTLE PEOPLE; the common (poor, lowly) people, the working class; "average man"
  212 People LIKE ME; people like us
  220 Unions, "LABOR", labor leaders
  230 BIG BUSINESS; industry, "business(men)"); Wall Street (except small businessman, code 240); agribusiness/large farming businesses
  231 RICH PEOPLE; upper classes; wealthy (powerful) people
  240 SMALL BUSINESSMEN
  250 MIDDLE CLASS people; white collar people
  260 FARMERS
  270 BLACKS
  280 OTHER RACIAL AND ETHNIC groups
  281 The SOUTH, some portion of the south
  282 The NORTH, some portion of the north
  283 White PEOPLE, white people only
  284 MINORITIES, minority groups (NA which)
  285 OLD people
  286 THE educated, intellectuals, students
  290 Other groups
- GENERAL PARTY DIFFERENCES FOR GROUPS:
  299 Group differences codeable in 200 or 300 series--NA which
- PARTY SEEN AS BAD FOR, ANTI, KEEPING IN CHECK, PUTTING IN PLACE:
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Divisive (sets class against class, caters to special interests (NA what), plays group politics, not for all the people; (Dems/Reps) ONLY FOR THEMSELVES

WORKING OR LITTLE PEOPLE; the common (poor, lowly) people, the working class; "average man"

People LIKE ME; people like us

Unions, "LABOR", labor leaders

BIG BUSINESS; industry, "business(men)", Wall Street (except small businessman, code 340)

RICH PEOPLE; upper classes; wealthy (powerful) people

SMALL BUSINESSMEN

MIDDLE CLASS people; white collar people

FARMERS

BLACKS

Racist, prejudiced, bigoted

Other racial and ethnic groups; "MINORITY GROUPS" other or not specified

The SOUTH, some portion of the south

The NORTH, some portion of the north

WHITE people, white people only

MINORITIES, minority groups (NA which)

OLD people

The EDUCATED, intellectuals, students

Other groups

DOMESTIC POLICY REFERENCES

- FISCAL POLICY--EASY SPENDING RESPONSES

SPEND MORE FREELY/high spenders (NFS)

Spend much relative to what is accomplished; WASTEFUL, not careful with spending

Spend much relative to money available; spend us DEEPER IN DEBT; DEFICIT SPENDING

Spend under special circumstances, such as hard times

Bring cheap money; more money circulating

Other easy spending response

RAISE TAXES--NFS; keep taxes high; seek to increase government revenues

INCREASE INCOME TAXES; will not cut income taxes; rely on increase in/high income tax to provide government revenues

- FISCAL POLICY--CAUTIOUS SPENDING RESPONSES

SPEND LESS FREELY; economy in government (NFS)

Spend little relative to what is accomplished; less wasteful/more careful with government (taxpayers’) money

Spend little relative to money available; REDUCE DEBT, keep debt from getting higher, BALANCED BUDGET

Spend little even when special circumstances might warrant

For sound money/tight money, deflation

Other cautious spending response

CUT TAXES--NFS; keep taxes low; seek to decrease government revenues

Cut INCOME TAXES; will not increase income taxes; rely on taxes other than income tax to provide government revenues
- FISCAL POLICY--GENERAL SPENDING RESPONSES

591 General mention of taxes--neutral or NA direction
599 General mention of spending--neutral or NA direction

- ASSOCIATION OF PARTY WITH GOOD/POSITIVE DOMESTIC SITUATIONS

411 Responsible promised (NA what); restraint on promises, realistic, doesn't promise too much
412 Don't have (too much) government control over the economy; or lets BUSINESS GET MORE INVOLVED/handle problems of poverty/unemployment, etc.
413 (GOOD) GOVERNMENT CONTROL OF THE ECONOMY, business
415 Good for the nation's economy--general positive reference
420 PROSPERITY in nation; good times for all, high national production, avoidance of depression, HIGH EMPLOYMENT
431 Price INFLATION HELD IN CHECK; lower cost of living
435 Propose/enact FAIR TAXES; believe everyone should be taxed the same/that taxes should be even-handed.
436 Give tax breaks to the poor/working/middle class people; tax policies favor the lower/middle classes
440 LOCAL PERSONAL GOOD TIMES economically; head of family gets (keeps) better job (wages) when party is in power, family better off economically under this party (no direct government benefits like social security mentioned)
450 HONESTY AND INTEGRITY--characteristics of the party or administration (local or national), other similar characteristics of the party
451 One party has MORE EXPERIENCE, is better, smarter, more united
480 (Only) party has a philosophy/program/platform; stands for something
490 Other positive domestic associations
491 General mention of unemployment--neutral or NA direction
492 General mention of inflation--neutral or NA direction
493 General mention of economic policy/handling of the economy

- GENERAL DOMESTIC POLICY RESPONSES

499 A domestic issue difference is cited which could be coded in the 400 or 500 series, but NA which

- ASSOCIATION OF PARTY WITH BAD/NEGATIVE DOMESTIC SITUATIONS

511 IRRESPONSIBLE PROMISES (NA what); promises too much; unrealistic, pie-in-the-sky; can't fulfill promises
512 Have (too much) govt control over the economy; or does not let business get more involved/handle problems of poverty/unemployment, etc.
513 (POOR) GOVERNMENT CONTROL OF THE ECONOMY
515 Bad for the nation's economy, general negative reference
520 Hard times, depression in nation, much
unemployment, low (over) production

531 Create/does not control price INFLATION; high cost of living in nation

535 Propose/enact UNFAIR TAXES; show favoritism/give tax breaks to certain groups or types of people

536 Give tax breaks to the wealth/corporations; tax policies favor the rich/powerful/upper classes

540 LOCAL/PERSONAL HARD TIMES economically; head of family gets laid off (poorer wages) when party is in power; family worse off economically under this party

550 Dishonesty/corruption (nepotism, graft, patronage) of party or administration (local or national); other similar characteristics of the party; Watergate

551 One party has LESS EXPERIENCE/is worse/not as smart; party is not (is less) unified

580 Party has no philosophy/programs/platform; doesn't stand for anything

590 Other negative domestic association with party - SPECIFIC DOMESTIC POLICIES FAVORED BY PARTY

600 MINIMUM WAGE legislation; favors raising minimum wage, or favors raising UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

601 Social Security; government pension raises

610 MEDICAL (HEALTH) INSURANCE; medical card for aged; socialized medicine; medicare

612 HOUSING; aid to the homeless

620 Government CONTROL OF UTILITIES; more attention to conservation; public works; mention of ecology, environment

630 Federal AID TO EDUCATION/school-building; teachers' pay higher

631 BUSING; forced integration

632 OTHER FED. CONTROL OF EDUCATION/schools response; school choice plans

634 Gun control

640 CIVIL RIGHTS; insist more strongly on civil rights

641 LAW AND ORDER--HARD LINE (or NA line); wants a police state; support death penalty (88)

642 LAW AND ORDER--SOFT LINE; oppose death penalty (88)

643 PROPERTY RIGHTS; open housing

644 Policies which would DIVIDE COUNTRY; have civil war; race war

650 Higher TARIFFS; less free trade

660 "Wet" legislation; ANTI-PROHIBITION

670 General mention of SOCIAL WELFARE; "GIVE AWAY PROGRAMS"

671 POVERTY program

672 EMPLOYMENT (JOB) TRAINING PROGRAMS, Job Corps, etc.

680 FARM policy

681 Abortion

682 Women's rights; ERA

683 Legalization of marijuana; (more) lenient drug laws

684 Homosexual/gay rights

690 Other specific domestic policy favored - SPECIFIC DOMESTIC POLICIES--NEUTRAL OR NA DIRECTION

605 Minimum WAGE or unemployment compensation

606 SOCIAL SECURITY; government pension

615 MEDICAL (HEALTH) INSURANCE; medical card for aged;
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socialized medicine; medicare
HOUSING; aid to the homeless
Government CONTROL OF UTILITIES; CONSERVATION;
public works; ecology, environment
Federal Aid TO EDUCATION; school choice plans
BUSSING; forced integration
Other federal control of education or schools response
Gun control
CIVIL RIGHTS (legislation)
LAW AND ORDER--HARD LINE (or NA line); death penalty (88)
LAW AND ORDER--SOFT LINE; death penalty (88)
PROPERTY RIGHTS; open housing
Policies which would DIVIDE COUNTRY; have civil war; race war
Higher TARIFFS; free trade
Prohibition; "dry"/"wet" legislation
General mention of SOCIAL WELFARE; "give away programs"
POVERTY program
EMPLOYMENT (JOB) TRAINING programs, Job Corps, etc.
FARM policy
ABORTION
Women's rights; ERA
Legalization of marijuana; lenient drug laws
Homosexual/GAY RIGHTS
Domestic issues difference, but NA which
- SPECIFIC DOMESTIC POLICIES OPPOSED BY PARTY
MINIMUM WAGE or UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION; won't raise minimum wage, won't improve unemployment compensation
SOCIAL SECURITY; against raising benefits
MEDICAL (HEALTH) INSURANCE; against medical card for aged; against socialized medicine, medicare
HOUSING; aid to the homeless
Government CONTROL OF UTILITIES; for private power; less interested in conservation; public works; mention of ecology, environment
Federal Aid TO EDUCATION; against or drag feet on aid to education
BUSSING; forced integration
OTHER FEDERAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION or schools response; school choice plans
Gun control
CIVIL RIGHTS; against or drag feet on civil rights legislation; leave it to states
Following a tough or HARD LINE IN MAINTENANCE OF LAW AND ORDER/prevention of crime, etc.; police state; imposing the death penalty (88)
Following a SOFT LINE IN MAINTENANCE OF LAW AND ORDER/prevention of crime, etc.; imposing the death penalty (88)
PROPERTY RIGHTS; open housing
Policies which would DIVIDE COUNTRY; have civil war; race war; want to unite the country
High TARIFFS; want free trade
Repeal; WANT PROHIBITION; "dry"
General mention of SOCIAL WELFARE; "GIVE AWAY
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PROGRAMS

771 POVERTY program
772 EMPLOYMENT (JOB) TRAINING programs, Job Corps, etc.
780 FARM policy
781 Abortion
782 Women's rights; ERA
783 Legalization of marijuana; lenient drug laws
784 Homosexual/gay rights
790 Other specific domestic policy opposed

FOREIGN POLICY REFERENCES

800 WAR; get us into war (faster); party associated with war; militarist
810 PEACE; more likely to keep peace; party associated with peace
820 INTERNATIONALIST; more for foreign aid, government activities abroad; cooperate with allies, U.N.; "more for foreign aid/trade"
825 Foreign aid/trade, NA direction
830 ISOLATIONIST; avoid foreign activities; cut foreign aid (military or economic); "cut foreign aid/trade"
840 NATIONAL SECURITY; for strong national defense (spending); strong (firm) (too aggressive) posture toward communism (Russia); too much defense spending
845 National defense--general, NA or neutral direction
850 INADEQUATE NATIONAL SECURITY; fail to maintain (spend for) defense; weak posture toward communism (Russia)
860 Specific TROUBLE SPOTS
870 CONTROL OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS
880 Strong FOREIGN POLICY
881 Weak foreign policy
884 SPACE; space policy
890 Other foreign policy--other substantive foreign policy mentions (direction of response usually indicated)
891 Mention of "foreign policy" difference but no substance or direction given (e.g., usual response is "the two parties or candidates differ on foreign policy, on how they will handle foreign policy")

MISCELLANEOUS AND NO PARTY DIFFERENCES RESPONSES

900 Miscellaneous other party differences
901 (Only) one party is more successful than the others; wins elections; is (is not) majority party, etc.
902 (Only) one party is less successful than the others; doesn't win elections much; is the minority party
910 PERSONALITY/CANDIDATE ONLY MENTIONS--candidate is dangerous, fanatic, aggressive, courageous, honest, untrustworthy, impulsive, outspoken, firm, dishonest, negative, lack of integrity, bad politician, etc. (but code 371 racist, prejudiced, bigoted)
920 Reference to probable inability to get things done, e.g., gain congressional support
930 LEADERSHIP MENTIONS--a good (bad) leader, is head
of the party must specifically mention the candidate as leader or head of the party), or one party has better leadership than another

980 The parties are different; EVERYTHING ABOUT THEM IS DIFFERENT (NA what the differences are)

NO DIFFERENCE ("NO" OR "DK")

991 There used to be differences, but not now
992 Indicate dissatisfaction with the lack of differences
993 Favorable to both parties, e.g., both parties are seeking to serve the people
994 Indicates that individual candidates are more important than parties anyhow
995 Unfavorable to both parties, e.g., both parties are just after money
996 On variation within parties
997 Other comments
998 DK (Code in 1st var only)
999 NA (Code in 1st var only)
000 No party differences ("No" or "DK" and no further comment); no further second or third differences

>> MASTER CODE

PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY BALLOT CARDS BY STATE (1992)

BALLOT CARD FOR ALABAMA
Candidates for the June 2nd Primary

Democrats Republicans
--------- -----------
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr. Patrick J. Buchanan
Bill Clinton George Bush
H. Ross Perot (write-in) H. Ross Perot (write-in)
Other Uncommitted
Uncommitted

BALLOT CARD FOR ARIZONA
Candidates for the March 7th Caucus

Democrats Republicans
--------- -----------
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr. No Caucus or Primary
Bill Clinton
Tom Harkin
Paul Tsongas
Uncommitted

BALLOT CARD FOR ARKANSAS
Candidates for the May 26th Primary

Democrats Republicans
--------- -----------
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr. Patrick J. Buchanan
Bill Clinton George Bush
Lyndon H. LaRouche H. Ross Perot (write-in)
H. Ross Perot (write-in)
Uncommitted

BALLOT CARD FOR CALIFORNIA
Candidates for the June 2nd Primary

Democrats Republicans
--------- -----------
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr. 
Bill Clinton 
Tom Harkin 
Paul E. Tsongas 
Bob Kerry 
Others 
Unc/Other

BALLOT CARD FOR COLORADO
Candidates for the March 3rd Primary
Democrats
--------
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr.
Bill Clinton 
Tom Harkin 
Paul E. Tsongas 
Other 
Uncommitted

Republicans
-----------
Patrick J. Buchanan
George Bush 
Others 
Uncommitted

BALLOT CARD FOR CONNECTICUT
Candidates for the March 24th Primary
Democrats
--------
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr. 
Bill Clinton 
Tom Harkin 
Paul E. Tsongas 
Other 
Uncommitted

Republicans
-----------
Patrick J. Buchanan 
George Bush 
David Duke 
Uncommitted

BALLOT CARD FOR FLORIDA
Candidates for the March 10th Primary
Democrats
--------
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr. 
Bill Clinton 
Tom Harkin 
Paul E. Tsongas 
Other 

Republicans
-----------
George Bush 
Patrick J. Buchanan

BALLOT CARD FOR GEORGIA
Candidates for the March 3rd Primary
Democrats
--------
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr. 
Bill Clinton 
Tom Harkin 
Bob Kerry 
Paul E. Tsongas 
Uncommitted

Republicans
-----------
Patrick J. Buchanan 
George Bush 
Others

BALLOT CARD FOR ILLINOIS
Candidates for the March 17th Primary
Democrats
--------
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr. 
Bill Clinton 
Paul E. Tsongas 
Uncommitted 
Others

Republicans
-----------
Patrick J. Buchanan 
George Bush 
Others
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## BALLOT CARD FOR INDIANA
### Candidates for the May 5th Primary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Democrats</th>
<th>Republicans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edmund G. &quot;Jerry&quot; Brown Jr.</td>
<td>Patrick J. Buchanan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Clinton</td>
<td>George Bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Kerrey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul E. Tsongas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## BALLOT CARD FOR IOWA
### Candidates for the February 10th Caucus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Democrats</th>
<th>Republicans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edmund G. Brown Jr.</td>
<td>George Bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Clinton</td>
<td>Uncommitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Harkin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Kerrey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul E. Tsongas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Uncommitted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## BALLOT CARD FOR KANSAS
### Candidates for the April 7th Primary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Democrats</th>
<th>Republicans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edmund G. &quot;Jerry&quot; Brown Jr.</td>
<td>Patrick J. Buchanan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Clinton</td>
<td>George Bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul E. Tsongas</td>
<td>David Duke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncommitted</td>
<td>Uncommitted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## BALLOT CARD FOR KENTUCKY
### Candidates for the May 26th Primary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Democrats</th>
<th>Republicans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edmund G. &quot;Jerry&quot; Brown Jr.</td>
<td>George Bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Clinton</td>
<td>Uncommitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul E. Tsongas</td>
<td>H. Ross Perot (write-in)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Ross Perot (write-in)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Uncommitted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## BALLOT CARD FOR LOUISIANA
### Candidates for the March 10th Primary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Democrats</th>
<th>Republicans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edmund G. &quot;Jerry&quot; Brown Jr.</td>
<td>Pat Buchanan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Clinton</td>
<td>George Bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Harkin</td>
<td>David Duke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul E. Tsongas</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## BALLOT CARD FOR MARYLAND
### Candidates for the March 3rd Primary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Democrats</th>
<th>Republicans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edmund G. &quot;Jerry&quot; Brown Jr.</td>
<td>Patrick J. Buchanan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Clinton</td>
<td>George Bush</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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BALLOT CARD FOR MASSACHUSETTS
Candidates for the March 10th Primary
Democrats
--------
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr.
Bill Clinton
Tom Harkin
Paul E. Tsongas
Other
Uncommitted

Republicans
-----------
Pat Buchanan
George Bush
David Duke
Other
Uncommitted

BALLOT CARD FOR MICHIGAN
Candidates for the March 17th Primary
Democrats
---------
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr.
Bill Clinton
Tom Harkin
Bob Kerry
Paul E. Tsongas
Uncommitted

Republicans
-----------
Patrick J. Buchanan
George Bush
David Duke
Uncommitted

BALLOT CARD FOR MINNESOTA
Candidates for the April 7th Primary
Democrats
---------
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr.
Bill Clinton
Paul E. Tsongas
Uncommitted/Others

Republicans
-----------
Patrick J. Buchanan
George Bush
Harold E. Stassen
Uncommitted/Others

BALLOT CARD FOR MISSOURI
March 10th Caucus
Democrats
---------
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr.
Bill Clinton
Paul E. Tsongas
Uncommitted

Republicans
-----------
George Bush
Pat Buchanan
Uncommitted

BALLOT CARD FOR NEBRASKA
Candidates for the May 12th Primary
Democrats
--------
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown, Jr.
Bill Clinton
Paul E. Tsongas
H. Ross Perot (write-in)
Other
Uncommitted

Republicans
-----------
Patrick J. Buchanan
George Bush
David Duke
H. Ross Perot (write-in)
Other

BALLOT CARD FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE
Candidates for the February 18th Primary
Democrats

Republicans
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Edmund G. Brown Jr.  George Bush
Bill Clinton  Patrick J. Buchanan
Tom Harkin  Jim Lennane
Bob Kerrey  Bill Clinton (Write-in)
Tom Laughlin  Ralph Nader (Write-in)
Paul E. Tsongas  Paul E. Tsongas (Write-in)
Charles Woods  (Others)
Mario M. Cuomo (Write-in)
Ralph Nader (Write-in)
Others

BALLOT CARD FOR NEW JERSEY
Candidates for the June 2nd Primary
Democrats  Republicans
----------  ----------
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr.  Patrick J. Buchanan
Bill Clinton  George Bush
Paul E. Tsongas  H. Ross Perot (write-in)
H. Ross Perot (write-in)  Uncommitted
Unc/other

BALLOT CARD FOR NEW MEXICO
Candidates for the June 2nd Primary
Democrats  Republican
----------  ----------
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr.  Patrick J. Buchanan
Bill Clinton  George Bush
Paul E. Tsongas  H. Ross Perot (write-in)
H. Ross Perot (write-in)  Uncommitted
Unc/other

BALLOT CARD FOR NEW YORK
Candidates for the April 7th Primary
Democrats  Republicans
----------  ----------
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown  No Primary
Bill Clinton
Paul E. Tsongas
Others

BALLOT CARD FOR NORTH CAROLINA
Candidates for the May 5th Primary
Democrats  Republicans
----------  ----------
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr.  Patrick J. Buchanan
Bill Clinton  George Bush
Paul E. Tsongas  No Preference
Others
No Preference

BALLOT CARD FOR OHIO
Candidates for the June 2nd Primary
Democrats  Republicans
----------  ----------
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr.  Patrick J. Buchanan
Bill Clinton  George Bush
Paul E. Tsongas  H. Ross Perot (write-in)
H. Ross Perot (write-in)
### BALLOT CARD FOR OREGON
Candidates for the May 19th Primary

**Democrats**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edmund G. &quot;Jerry&quot; Brown Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul E. Tsongas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Ross Perot (write-in)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Republicans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patrick J. Buchanan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Duke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Ross Perot (write-in)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Others**


### BALLOT CARD FOR PENNSYLVANIA

Democrat: April 28th Primary  
Reps: April 28th Caucus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edmund G. &quot;Jerry&quot; Brown Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul E. Tsongas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patrick J. Buchanan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncommitted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BALLOT CARD FOR TENNESSEE
Candidates for the March 10th Primary

**Democrats**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edmund G. &quot;Jerry&quot; Brown Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Harkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul E. Tsongas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Republicans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pat Buchanan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Duke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncommitted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BALLOT CARD FOR TEXAS
Candidates for the March 10th Primary

**Democrats**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edmund G. &quot;Jerry&quot; Brown Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Harkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul E. Tsongas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Republicans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pat Buchanan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Duke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncommitted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BALLOT CARD FOR VIRGINIA

Democrats: Apr. 11, 13 Caucuses  
Reps: No Caucus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edmund G. &quot;Jerry&quot; Brown Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Clinton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uncommitted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BALLOT CARD FOR WASHINGTON
Candidates for the May 19th Primary

**Democrats**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edmund G. &quot;Jerry&quot; Brown Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul E. Tsongas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Ross Perot (write-in)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Others**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patrick J. Buchanan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Duke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Michael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Ross Perot (write-in)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BALLOT CARD FOR WEST VIRGINIA
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Candidates for the May 12th Primary

Democrats                      Republicans
---------                     -----------
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr.   Patrick J. Buchanan
Bill Clinton                  George Bush
Angus McDonald                Jack Fellure
Paul E. Tsongas               H. Ross Perot (write-in)
H. Ross Perot (write-in)
Others

Candidates for the April 7th Primary

Democrats                     Republicans
---------                     -----------
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr.   Patrick J. Buchanan
Bill Clinton                  George Bush
Paul E. Tsongas               David Duke
Other                         Uncommitted
Uncommitted

Candidates for the April 7th Primary

Democrats: March 7 Caucus

Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr.
Bill Clinton
Tom Harkin
Paul E. Tsongas
Uncommitted

Republicans: March 7-31 Caucuses

George Bush
Uncommitted

>> MASTER CODE

TYPE OF RACE

HOUSE

DEMOCRATIC INCUMBENT RUNNING
12 Democratic incumbent running -- REPUBLICAN CHALLENGER
13 Democratic incumbent running -- OTHER CHALLENGER
14 Democratic incumbent running -- UNOPPOSED
19 Democratic incumbent running -- REPUBLICAN AND OTHER CHALLENGERS

REPUBLICAN INCUMBENT RUNNING
21 Republican incumbent running -- DEMOCRATIC CHALLENGER
23 Republican incumbent running -- OTHER CHALLENGER
24 Republican incumbent running -- UNOPPOSED
29 Republican incumbent running -- DEMOCRATIC AND OTHER CHALLENGERS

OTHER INCUMBENT RUNNING
31 Other incumbent running -- DEMOCRATIC CHALLENGER
32 Other incumbent running -- REPUBLICAN CHALLENGER
34 Other incumbent running -- UNOPPOSED

NO INCUMBENT RUNNING
51 Democratic incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE UNOPPOSED
## Democratic Incumbent not running

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent not running -- REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE UNOPPOSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent not running -- OTHER CANDIDATE UNOPPOSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN CANDIDATES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent not running -- REPUBLICAN AND OTHER CANDIDATES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN AND OTHER CANDIDATES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN AND OTHER CANDIDATES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Republican Incumbent not running

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Republican incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE UNOPPOSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Republican incumbent not running -- REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE UNOPPOSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Republican incumbent not running -- OTHER CANDIDATE UNOPPOSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Republican incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN CANDIDATES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Republican incumbent not running -- REPUBLICAN AND OTHER CANDIDATES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Republican incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC AND OTHER CANDIDATES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Republican incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN AND OTHER CANDIDATES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Other Incumbent not running

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Other incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE UNOPPOSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Other incumbent not running -- REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE UNOPPOSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Other incumbent not running -- OTHER CANDIDATE UNOPPOSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Other incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN CANDIDATES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Other incumbent not running -- REPUBLICAN AND OTHER CANDIDATES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Other incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC AND OTHER CANDIDATES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Other incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN AND OTHER CANDIDATES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Senate

#### Democratic Incumbent running

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent running -- REPUBLICAN CHALLENGER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent running -- OTHER CHALLENGER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent running -- UNOPPOSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent running -- REPUBLICAN AND OTHER CHALLENGERS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Republican Incumbent running

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Republican incumbent running -- DEMOCRATIC CHALLENGER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Republican incumbent running -- OTHER CHALLENGER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Republican incumbent running -- UNOPPOSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Republican incumbent running -- DEMOCRATIC AND OTHER CHALLENGERS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Other Incumbent running

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Other incumbent running -- DEMOCRATIC CHALLENGER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Other incumbent running -- REPUBLICAN CHALLENGER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Other incumbent running -- UNOPPOSED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NO INCUMBENT RUNNING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE UNOPPOSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent not running -- REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE UNOPPOSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent not running -- OTHER CANDIDATE UNOPPOSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN CANDIDATES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent not running -- REPUBLICAN AND OTHER CANDIDATES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC AND OTHER CANDIDATES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Democratic incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN AND OTHER CANDIDATES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Republican incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE UNOPPOSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Republican incumbent not running -- REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE UNOPPOSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Republican incumbent not running -- OTHER CANDIDATE UNOPPOSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Republican incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN CANDIDATES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Republican incumbent not running -- REPUBLICAN AND OTHER CANDIDATES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Republican incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC AND OTHER CANDIDATES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Republican incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN AND OTHER CANDIDATES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Other incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE UNOPPOSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Other incumbent not running -- REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE UNOPPOSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Other incumbent not running -- OTHER CANDIDATE UNOPPOSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Other incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN CANDIDATES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Other incumbent not running -- REPUBLICAN AND OTHER CANDIDATES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Other incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC AND OTHER CANDIDATES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Other incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN AND OTHER CANDIDATES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NO RACE IN STATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>DEMOCRATIC INCUMBENTS, no race in state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>REPUBLICAN INCUMBENTS, no race in state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN INCUMBENTS, no race in state</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

>> MASTER CODE

CITY CODE

This list was developed from the 1973 WORLD ALMANAC AND BOOK OF FACTS, pp. 152-188 (1970 population figures).
- The first four digits are a unique code number for each city.

Page 338
- The fifth digit is the urbanicity code for each city, as used in the 1971 Quality of Life study:
  1 = City of over 1,000,000
  2 = City of over 25,000 and up to 250,000 in an SMSA of 1,000,000 or more[1]
  3 = City of under 25,000 in an SMSA of 1,000,000 or more
  4 = City of over 250,000 and up to 1,000,000
  5 = City of over 50,000 and up to 250,000 not in SMSA of 1,000,000 or more
  6 = City of 50,000 or less not in SMSA of 1,000,000 or more
  9 = NA

[1] The two 1970 STANDARD CONSOLIDATED AREAS (New York-Northeastern New Jersey, and Chicago, Ill.-Northwestern Indiana), the remaining 1970 SMCA's of one million or more, plus the Anaheim-Santa Ana-Garden Grove, CA SMSA (which was attached to the Los Angeles SMSA).

Asterisk (*) indicates place added in 1982 (having population of 25,000+ in 1980 census) coded on basis of 1970 status in area. (See example Chandler, Arizona -- it's SMSA was not over one million in 1970, so coded 6 here. This was done to avoid glaring inconsistencies in adjacent areas. The areas affected by this decision are the four places where the population of the SMSA topped the one million mark between 1970 and 1980 (Phoenix, Arizona; San Antonio, Texas; Ft. Lauderdale/Hollywood, Florida; Sacramento, California).

ALABAMA  (141)
0001 6   Anniston
0015 6   Auburn *
0002 6   Bessemer
0003 4   Birmingham
0004 6   Decatur
0005 6   Dothan
0006 6   Florence
0007 5   Gadsden
0008 5   Huntsville
0009 5   Mobile
0010 5   Montgomery
0011 6   Phoenix City
0012 6   Prichard
0013 6   Selma
0014 5   Tuscaloosa

ALASKA  (180)
0100 6   Anchorage

ARIZONA  (161)
0208 6   Chandler *
0200 6   Flagstaff
0201 6   Glendale
0202 5   Mesa
0203 4   Phoenix
0204 5   Scottsdale
0209 6   Sun City *
0205 5   Tempe
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0206</td>
<td>Tuscon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0207</td>
<td>Yuma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0300</td>
<td>Blytheville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0301</td>
<td>El Dorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0302</td>
<td>Fayetteville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0303</td>
<td>Fort Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0304</td>
<td>Hot Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0310</td>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0305</td>
<td>Jonesboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0306</td>
<td>Little Rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0307</td>
<td>North Little Rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0308</td>
<td>Pine Bluff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0309</td>
<td>West Memphis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Arkansas** (142)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0400</td>
<td>Alameda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0401</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0402</td>
<td>Altadena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0403</td>
<td>Anaheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0404</td>
<td>Antioch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0405</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0406</td>
<td>Arden-Arcade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0407</td>
<td>Azusa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0408</td>
<td>Bakersfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0409</td>
<td>Baldwin Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0557</td>
<td>Bell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0410</td>
<td>Bellflower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0411</td>
<td>Bell Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0412</td>
<td>Belmont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0413</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0414</td>
<td>Beverly Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0558</td>
<td>Brea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0415</td>
<td>Buena Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0416</td>
<td>Burbank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0417</td>
<td>Burlingame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0559</td>
<td>Camarillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0418</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0560</td>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0419</td>
<td>Carmichael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0420</td>
<td>Carson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0421</td>
<td>Castro Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0561</td>
<td>Cerritos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0562</td>
<td>Chico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0563</td>
<td>Chino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0422</td>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0564</td>
<td>Citrus Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0423</td>
<td>Claremont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0565</td>
<td>Clovis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0424</td>
<td>Compton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0425</td>
<td>Concord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0426</td>
<td>Corona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0427</td>
<td>Costa Mesa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0428</td>
<td>Covina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0429</td>
<td>Culver City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0566</td>
<td>Cupertino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0430</td>
<td>Cypress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0431</td>
<td>Daly City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0567 2 Danville *
0432 6 Davis
0568 2 Diamond Bar *
0433 2 Downey
0434 2 East Los Angeles
0435 2 El Cajon
0436 2 El Cerrito
0437 2 El Monte
0569 2 El Toro *
0438 2 Escondido
0439 6 Eureka
0440 6 Fairfield
0441 2 Florence-Graham
0570 2 Fontana *
0442 2 Fountain Valley
0443 2 Fremont
0444 5 Fresno
0445 2 Fullerton
0446 2 Gardena
0447 2 Garden Grove
0448 2 Glendale
0449 2 Glendora
0450 2 Hacienda Heights
0451 2 Hawthorne
0452 2 Hayward
0453 2 Huntington Beach
0454 2 Huntington Park
0455 2 Inglewood
0571 2 Irvine *
0572 2 Laguna Hills *
0456 2 La Habra
0457 2 Lakewood
0458 2 La Mesa
0459 2 La Mirada
0460 2 Lancaster
0461 2 La Puente
0462 2 Lawndale
0463 2 Livermore
0464 6 Lodl
0465 6 Lompoc
0466 4 Long Beach
0467 2 Los Altos
0468 1 Los Angeles
0469 2 Los Gatos
0470 2 Lynwood
0471 2 Manhatten Beach
0573 6 Manteca *
0573 6 1992: Manteca *
0472 2 Menlo Park
0574 6 Merced *
0473 2 Milpitas
0575 2 Mission Viejo *
0474 5 Modesto
0475 2 Monrovia
0476 2 Montebello
0477 6 Monterey
0478 2 Monterey Park
0479 2 Mountain View
0480 6 Napa
0481 2 National City
0482 2 Newark
0483 2 Newport Beach
0484 6 North Highlands
0485 2 Norwalk
0486 2 Novato
0487 4 Oakland
0488 2 Oceanside
0489 2 Ontario
0490 2 Orange
0491 5 Oxnard
0492 2 Pacifica
0576 2 Palm Springs *
0493 2 Palo Alto
0494 2 Palos Verdes Peninsula
0495 2 Paramount
0496 6 Parkway-Sacramento South
0497 2 Pasadena
0498 6 Petaluma
0499 2 Pico Rivera
0577 2 Pittsburg *
0578 2 Placentia *
0500 2 Pleasant Hill
0579 2 Pleasanton *
0501 2 Pomona
0580 2 Poway *
0502 6 Rancho Cordova
0581 2 Rancho Cucamonga *
0582 2 Rancho Palos Verdes *
0583 6 Redding *
0503 2 Redlands
0504 2 Redondo Beach
0505 2 Redwood City
0506 2 Rialto
0507 2 Richmond
0508 2 Riverside
0509 2 Rosemead
0584 2 Rowland Heights *
0510 4 Sacramento
0511 5 Salinas
0512 2 San Bernardino
0513 2 San Bruno
0514 2 San Carlos
0585 2 San Clemente *
0515 4 San Diego
0516 4 San Francisco
0517 2 San Gabriel
0518 4 San Jose
0519 2 San Leandro
0520 2 San Lorenzo
0521 6 San Luis Obispo
0522 2 San Mateo
0523 2 San Rafael
0524 2 Santa Ana
0525 5 Santa Barbara
0526 2 Santa Clara
0527 6 Santa Cruz
0528 6 Santa Maria
0529 2 Santa Monica
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0530 5   Santa Rosa
0586 2   Santee *
0531 2   Saratoga
0532 2   Seal Beach
0533 6   Seaside
0534 5   Simi Valley
0535 2   South Gate
0536 2   South San Francisco
0537 2   South Whittier
0538 2   Spring Valley
0539 5   Stockton
0540 2   Sunnyvale
0541 2   Temple City
0542 6   Thousand Oaks
0543 2   Torrance
0587 6   Turlock *
0588 2   Tustin *
0544 2   Tustin-Foothills
0589 2   Union City *
0545 2   Upland
0590 6   Vacaville *
0546 5   Vallejo
0547 5   Ventura
0548 6   Visalia
0549 2   Vista
0550 2   Walnut Creek
0551 2   West Covina
0552 2   West Hollywood
0553 2   Westminster
0554 9   Westmont
0555 2   Whittier
0556 2   Willowbrook
0591 6   Woodland *
0592 2   Yorba Linda *

COLORADO  (162)
0600 2   Arvada
0601 2   Aurora
0602 2   Boulder
0603 5   Colorado Springs
0604 4   Denver
0605 2   Englewood
0606 6   Fort Collins
0613 6   Grand Junction *
0607 6   Greeley
0608 2   Lakewood
0609 2   Littleton
0614 2   Longmont *
0615 6   Loveland *
0610 9   North Glenn
0611 5   Pueblo
0616 2   Southglen *
0617 2   Thornton *
0618 2   Westminster *
0612 2   Wheat Ridge

CONNECTICUT  (101)
0700 5   Bridgeport
0701 5   Bristol
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0702</td>
<td>Danbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0703</td>
<td>East Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0704</td>
<td>East Haven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0705</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0706</td>
<td>Fairfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0707</td>
<td>Greenwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0708</td>
<td>Groton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0709</td>
<td>Hamden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0710</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0711</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0712</td>
<td>Meriden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0713</td>
<td>Middletown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0714</td>
<td>Milford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0715</td>
<td>Naugatuck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0716</td>
<td>New Britain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0717</td>
<td>New Haven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0718</td>
<td>New London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0719</td>
<td>Norwalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0720</td>
<td>Norwalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0721</td>
<td>Shelton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0722</td>
<td>Southington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0723</td>
<td>Stamford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0724</td>
<td>Stratford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0725</td>
<td>Torrington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0726</td>
<td>Trumball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0727</td>
<td>Vernon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0728</td>
<td>Wallingford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0729</td>
<td>Waterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0730</td>
<td>West Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0731</td>
<td>West Haven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0732</td>
<td>Westport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0733</td>
<td>Wethersfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0734</td>
<td>Windsor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DELAWARE (111)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0801</td>
<td>Newark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0800</td>
<td>Wilmington</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (155)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0900</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FLORIDA (143)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Boca Raton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1032</td>
<td>Boynton Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1033</td>
<td>Bradenton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1034</td>
<td>Cape Coral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001</td>
<td>Carol City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1002</td>
<td>Clearwater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1003</td>
<td>Coral Gables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Coral Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1004</td>
<td>Daytona Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1036</td>
<td>Deerfield Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1037</td>
<td>Delray Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1038</td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1005</td>
<td>Fort Lauderdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1007</td>
<td>Fort Myers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1008</td>
<td>Fort Pierce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009</td>
<td>Gainsville</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1039</td>
<td>Hallandale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1010</td>
<td>Hialeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011</td>
<td>Hollywood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1012</td>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1040</td>
<td>Kendale Lakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1013</td>
<td>Kendall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1014</td>
<td>Key West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1015</td>
<td>Lakeland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1041</td>
<td>Lake Worth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1042</td>
<td>Largo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1043</td>
<td>Lauderdale Lakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1044</td>
<td>Lauderhill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1045</td>
<td>Margate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1016</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1017</td>
<td>Merritt Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1018</td>
<td>Miami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1019</td>
<td>Miami Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1046</td>
<td>Miramar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1020</td>
<td>North Miami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1021</td>
<td>North Miami Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1047</td>
<td>Ocala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1048</td>
<td>Olympia Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1022</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1023</td>
<td>Panama City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1049</td>
<td>Pembroke Pines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1024</td>
<td>Pensacola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1050</td>
<td>Pine Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1051</td>
<td>Pinellas Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1052</td>
<td>Plantation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1025</td>
<td>Pompano Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1053</td>
<td>Port Charlotte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1054</td>
<td>Riviera Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1026</td>
<td>St. Petersburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1027</td>
<td>Sarasota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1055</td>
<td>Sunrise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1028</td>
<td>Tallahassee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1056</td>
<td>Tamarac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1029</td>
<td>Tampa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1030</td>
<td>Titusville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1057</td>
<td>Town 'N' country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1058</td>
<td>Westchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1059</td>
<td>West Little River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1031</td>
<td>West Palm Beach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GEORGIA (144)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>Albany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1101</td>
<td>Athens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1102</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1103</td>
<td>Augusta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1113</td>
<td>Candler-McCAfee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1104</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1105</td>
<td>East Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1106</td>
<td>Fort Benning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1114</td>
<td>Mableton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1107</td>
<td>Macon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1108</td>
<td>Marietta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1115</td>
<td>North Atlanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1109</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1116</td>
<td>Sandy Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1334</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* denotes cities with asterisks for specific reasons.
Highland Park
Hoffman Estates
Jollet
Kankakee
Lansing
Lombard
Maywood
Moline
Morton Grove
Mount Prospect
Naperville
Niles
Normal
Northbrook
North Chicago
Oak Forest
Oak Lawn
Oak Park
Palatine
Park Forest
Park Ridge
Pekin
Peoria
Quincy
Rantoul
Rockford
Rock Island
Shaumburg
Skokie
South Holland
Springfield
Tinley Park
Urbana
Villa Park
Waukegan
Wheaton
Wilmette

INDIANA

Anderson
Bloomington
Columbus
East Chicago
Elkhart
Evansville
Fort Wayne
Gary
Hammond
Highland
Indianapolis
Kokomo
Lafayette
Lawrence
Marion
Merrillville
Michigan City
Mishawaka
Muncie
New Albany
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1523 2 Portage *
1518 6 Richmond
1519 5 South Bend
1520 5 Terre Haute

IOWA  (131)
1600 6 Ames
1616 6 Bettendorf *
1601 6 Burlington
1602 6 Cedar Falls
1603 5 Cedar Rapids
1604 6 Clinton
1605 5 Council Bluffs
1606 5 Davenport
1607 5 Des Moines
1608 5 Dubuque
1609 6 Fort Dodge
1610 6 Iowa City
1611 6 Marshalltown
1612 6 Mason City
1613 6 Ottumwa
1614 5 Sioux City
1615 5 Waterloo

KANSAS  (132)
1710 6 Emporia *
1700 6 Hutchinson
1701 2 Kansas City
1702 6 Lawrence
1703 6 Leavenworth
1704 6 Manhattan
1711 2 Olathe *
1705 2 Overland Park
1706 2 Prairie Village
1707 6 Salina
1712 2 Shawnee *
1708 5 Topeka
1709 4 Witchita

KENTUCKY  (151)
1800 6 Ashland
1801 6 Bowling Green
1802 2 Covington
1803 6 Fort Knox
1811 6 Frankfort *
1812 6 Henderson *
1813 6 Hopkinsville *
1804 5 Lexington-Fayette
1805 4 Louisville
1806 2 Newport
1807 5 Owensboro
1808 6 Paducah
1809 6 Pleasure Ridge Park
1810 6 Valley Station

LOUISIANA  (145)
1900 6 Alexandria
1901 5 Baton Rouge
1902 6 Bossier City
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chalmette *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gretna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Houma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kenner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lafayette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lake Charles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Marrero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Metairie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Monroe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>New Iberia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>New Orleans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Shreveport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Slidell *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MAINE (102)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Auburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bangor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lewiston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Portland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MARYLAND (152)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Annapolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2123</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Aspen Hill *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2101</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2102</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bethesda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2103</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bowie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2104</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Catonsville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2105</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chillum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2106</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>College Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2124</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Columbia *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2107</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cumberland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2108</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dundalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2109</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Essex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2125</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Frederick *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2126</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gaithersburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2110</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glen Burnie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2111</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hagerstown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2112</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hillcrest Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2127</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lochearn *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2113</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lutherville-Timonium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2128</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Middle River *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2129</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Oxen Hill *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2114</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Parkville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2115</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pikesville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2130</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Potomac *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2116</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Randallstown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2117</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rockville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2131</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Security *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2118</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Silver Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2119</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Suitland-Silver Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2120</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Towson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2121</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wheaton-Glenmont</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MASSACHUSETTS (103)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2260</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Agawam *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Amherst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2201</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Andover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2202</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Arlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2203</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Attleboro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Barnstable
Belmont
Beverly
Billerica
Boston
Braintree
Brockton
Brookline
Cambridge
Chelmsford
Chelsea
Chicopee
Danvers
Dedham
Everett
Fall River
Fitchburg
Framingham
Gloucester
Haverhill
Holyoke
Lawrence
Leominster
Lexington
Lowell
Lynn
Malden
Marlborough
Medford
Melrose
Methuen
Milton
Natick
Needham
New Bedford
Newton
Northampton
Norwood
Peabody
Pittsfield
Plymouth
Quincy
Randolph
Revere
Salem
Saugus
Somerville
Springfield
Stoughton
Tauton
Wakefield
Waltham
Watertown
Wellesley
Westfield
West Springfield
Weymouth
Woburn
Worcester
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2300</td>
<td>Allen Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2301</td>
<td>Ann Arbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2302</td>
<td>Battle Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2303</td>
<td>Bay City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2304</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2305</td>
<td>Bloomfield Twp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2306</td>
<td>Burton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2307</td>
<td>Clinton Twp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2308</td>
<td>Dearborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2309</td>
<td>Dearborn Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2310</td>
<td>Detroit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2311</td>
<td>East Detroit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2312</td>
<td>East Lansing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2313</td>
<td>Farmington Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2314</td>
<td>Ferndale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2315</td>
<td>Flint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2316</td>
<td>Garden City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2317</td>
<td>Grand Rapids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2318</td>
<td>Hamtramck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2319</td>
<td>Highland Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2320</td>
<td>Holland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2321</td>
<td>Inkster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2322</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2323</td>
<td>Kalamazoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2324</td>
<td>Kentwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2325</td>
<td>Lansing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2326</td>
<td>Lincoln Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2327</td>
<td>Livonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2328</td>
<td>Madison Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2329</td>
<td>Midland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2330</td>
<td>Muskegon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2331</td>
<td>Oak Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2332</td>
<td>Pontiac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2333</td>
<td>Portage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2334</td>
<td>Port Huron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2335</td>
<td>Redford Twp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2336</td>
<td>Romulus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2337</td>
<td>Roseville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2338</td>
<td>Royal Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2339</td>
<td>Saginaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2340</td>
<td>St. Clair Shores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2341</td>
<td>Southfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2342</td>
<td>Southgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2343</td>
<td>Sterling Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2344</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2345</td>
<td>Troy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2346</td>
<td>Trenton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2347</td>
<td>Troy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2348</td>
<td>Warren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2349</td>
<td>Waterford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2350</td>
<td>West Bloomfield Twp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2351</td>
<td>Westfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2352</td>
<td>Wyandotte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2353</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2354</td>
<td>Ypsilanti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2423</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2401</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2402</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2403</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2424</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2404</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2405</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2406</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2407</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2408</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2409</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2410</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2411</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2412</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2413</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2414</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2425</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2415</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2416</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2417</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2418</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2419</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2420</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2421</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2422</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MISSISSIPPI (146)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>City Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2500</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Biloxi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2501</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2502</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Greenville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2503</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Gulfport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2504</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hattiesburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2505</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2506</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Laurel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2507</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Meridian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2508</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pascagoula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2509</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Vicksburg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MISSOURI (134)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>City Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2600</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Affton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2620</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Blue Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2601</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cape Girardeau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2602</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2603</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ferguson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2604</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Florissant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2605</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fort Leonard Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2621</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gladstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2606</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2607</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Jefferson City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2608</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Joplin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2609</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kansas City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2610</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kirkwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2622</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lee's Summit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lemay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2612</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Overland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2613</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Raytown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2614</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>St. Charles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2615</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>St. Joseph</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MONTANA (164)
2700 5  Billings
2703 6  Butte-Silver Bow *
2701 5  Great Falls
2702 6  Missoula

NEBRASKA (135)
2800 6  Grand Island
2801 5  Lincoln
2802 4  Omaha

NEVADA (165)
2905 6  Carson City *
2900 5  Las Vegas
2901 6  North Las Vegas
2902 6  Paradise
2903 5  Reno
2904 6  Sparks
2906 6  Sunrise Manor *

NEW HAMPSHIRE (104)
3000 6  Concord
3001 5  Manchester
3002 5  Nashua
3003 6  Portsmouth

NEW JERSEY (112)
3100 6  Atlantic City
3101 2  Bayonne
3102 2  Belleville
3103 2  Bergenfield
3104 2  Bloomfield
3105 6  Brick Twp.
3106 2  Camden
3107 2  Cherry Hill Twp.
3108 2  Clifton
3109 2  Cranford Twp.
3110 2  Deptford Twp.
3111 2  East Brunswick Twp.
3112 2  East Orange
3113 2  Edison Twp.
3114 2  Elizabeth
3115 2  Englewood
3116 9  Ewing Twp.
3117 2  Fair Lawn
3118 6  Fort Dix
3119 2  Fort Lee
3120 2  Garfield
3121 2  Hackensack
3122 2  Hoboken
3123 2  Irvington
3124 4  Jersey City
3125 2  Kearny
3126 2  Linden
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3127 2 Livingston Twp.
3128 2 Lodi
3129 6 Long Branch
3130 2 Maplewood Twp.
3131 2 Mercerville-Hamilton Sq.
3132 5 Middletown Twp.
3133 2 Montclair
3134 5 Neptune Twp.
3135 4 Newark
3136 2 New Brunswick
3137 9 New Hanover
3138 2 North Bergen Twp.
3139 2 Nutley
3140 2 Old Bridge
3141 2 Orange
3142 2 Paramus
3143 2 Parsippany--Troy Hills *
3144 2 Passaic
3145 2 Paterson
3146 2 Pennsauken Twp.
3147 2 Perth Amboy
3148 2 Piscataway Twp.
3149 2 Plainfield
3150 2 Rahway
3151 2 Ridgewood
3152 2 Sayreville
3153 5 Sayreville
3154 2 Teaneck Twp.
3155 5 Trenton
3156 2 Union Twp.
3157 2 Union City
3158 6 Vineland
3159 5 Wayne Twp.
3160 5 West Orange
3161 2 Willingboro Twp.
3162 2 Woodbridge Twp.

NEW MEXICO  (166)
3200 5 Albuquerque
3201 6 Carlsbad *
3202 6 Clovis
3203 6 Farmington *
3204 6 Hobbs
3205 6 Las Cruces
3206 6 Roswell
3207 6 Santa Fe
3208 6 South Valley

NEW YORK  (113)
3300 5 Albany
3301 6 Amsterdam
3302 6 Auburn
3303 2 Baldwin
3304 5 Binghampton
3305 2 Brentwood
3306 4 Brighton *
3307 4 Buffalo
3308 2 Centereach *
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3307</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Central Islip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3356</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cheektowaga *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3308</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Commack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3309</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Deer Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3357</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dix Hills *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3310</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>East Meadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3311</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Elmira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3312</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Elmont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3313</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Franklin Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3314</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Freeport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3315</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Garden City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3316</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glen Cove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3317</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hempstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3318</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hicksville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3319</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Huntington Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3358</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Irondeqoit *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3320</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ithaca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3321</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Jamestown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3322</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kingston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3323</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lackawanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3359</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lake Ronkonkoma *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3324</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Levittown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3325</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lindenhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3326</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lockport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3327</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3328</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Massapequa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3329</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Merrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3330</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mount Vernon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3331</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Newburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3332</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>New City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3333</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>New Rochelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3334</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3335</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Niagara Falls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3336</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>North Babylon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3360</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>North Bay Shore *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3337</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>North Tonawanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3338</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Oceanside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3339</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Plainview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3340</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Port Chester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3341</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Poughkeepsie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3342</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3343</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rockville Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3344</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3345</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3346</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Schenectady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3361</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Smithtown *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3347</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Syracuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3362</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tonawanda *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3348</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Troy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3349</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Utica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3350</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Valley Stream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3351</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Watertown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3363</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>West Babylon *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3364</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>West Islip *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3365</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>West Senaca *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3352</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>White Plains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3353</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yonkers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NORTH CAROLINA    (147)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3400</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Asheville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3401</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Burlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3402</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Camp Lejeune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3403</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Chapel Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3404</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3405</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3406</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fayetteville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3407</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fort Bragg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3408</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Gastonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3409</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Goldsboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3410</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Greensboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3411</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Greenville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3412</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>High Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3413</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kannapolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3414</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kinston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3415</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3416</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Rocky Mount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3417</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3418</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Winston-Salem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NORTH DAKOTA (136)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3500</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bismarck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3501</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3502</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3503</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Minot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OHIO (124)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3600</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Akron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3601</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3602</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Athens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3603</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Austintown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3604</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Barberton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3651</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Beavercreek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3605</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Boardman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3652</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bowling Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3606</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Brook Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3653</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Brunswick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3607</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Canton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3608</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3609</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3610</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cleveland Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3611</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3612</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cuyahoga Falls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3613</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3654</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Delhi Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3614</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>East Cleveland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3615</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Elyria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3616</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Euclid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3617</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fairborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3655</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fairfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3618</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Findlay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3619</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Garfield Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3620</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3656</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Huber Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3621</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3622</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kettering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3623</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lakewood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3624</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lancaster</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3625 5   Lima
3626 5   Lorain
3627 5   Mansfield
3628 2   Maple Heights
3629 6   Marion
3630 6   Massillon
3631 2   Mentor
3632 6   Middletown
3633 6   Newark
3634 2   North Olmsted
3635 2   Norwood
3636 2   Parma
3637 9   Parma Heights
3638 6   Portsmouth
3639 6   Sandusky
3640 2   Shaker Heights
3641 2   South Euclid
3642 5   Springfield
3643 6   Steubenville
3657 6   Stow *
3658 2   Strongsville *
3644 4   Toledo
3645 2   Upper Arlington
3646 5   Warren
3647 2   Whitehall
3648 2   Xenia
3649 5   Youngstown
3650 6   Zanesville

OKLAHOMA (153)
3700 6   Bartlesville
3712 6   Broken Arrow *
3701 6   Del City
3713 6   Edmond *
3702 6   Enid
3703 5   Lawton
3704 6   Midwest City
3714 6   Moore *
3705 6   Muskogee
3706 5   Norman
3707 4   Oklahoma City
3708 6   Ponca City
3709 6   Shawnee
3710 6   Stilwater
3711 4   Tulsa

OREGON (172)
3806 6   Albany *
3807 2   Beaverton *
3800 6   Corvallis
3801 5   Eugene
3808 2   Gresham *
3809 2   Hazelwood *
3810 2   Hillsboro *
3802 6   Medford
3803 4   Portland
3804 5   Salem
3805 6   Springfield
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3900</td>
<td>Allentown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3902</td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3903</td>
<td>Bethel Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3904</td>
<td>Bethlehem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3905</td>
<td>Chester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3906</td>
<td>Easton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3907</td>
<td>Erie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3908</td>
<td>Harrisburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3909</td>
<td>Hazleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3910</td>
<td>Johnstown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3911</td>
<td>Lancaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3912</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3913</td>
<td>McKeesport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3914</td>
<td>Monroeville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3915</td>
<td>New Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3916</td>
<td>Norristown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3917</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3918</td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3919</td>
<td>Pottstown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3920</td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3921</td>
<td>Scranton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3922</td>
<td>State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3923</td>
<td>Wilkes-Barre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3924</td>
<td>Wilkinsburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3925</td>
<td>Williamsport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3926</td>
<td>York</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4000</td>
<td>Cranston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4001</td>
<td>Cumberland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4002</td>
<td>East Providence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4003</td>
<td>Middletown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4004</td>
<td>Newport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4005</td>
<td>North Kingstown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4006</td>
<td>North Providence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RHODE ISLAND (105)
Pawtucket
Providence
Warwick
West Warwick
Woonsocket

SOUTH CAROLINA  (148)
Anderson
Charleston
Columbia
Florence
Greenville
North Charleston *
Rock Hill
Spartanburg
Sumter

SOUTH DAKOTA  (137)
Aberdeen
Rapid City
Sioux Falls

TENNESSEE  (154)
Chattanooga
Clarksville
Cleveland *
Columbia *
Hendersonville *
Jackson
Johnson City
Kingsport
Knoxville
Memphis
Murfeesboro
Nashville-Davidson
Oak Ridge

TEXAS  (149)
Abilene
Amarillo
Arlington
Austin
Baytown
Beaumont
Big Spring
Brownsville
Bryan
Carrollton *
College Station *
Corpus Christi
Dallas
Del Rio *
Denison
Denton
Duncanville *
El Paso
Farmers Branch
Fort Hood
Fort Worth
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4417 5    Galveston
4418 2    Garland
4419 2    Grand Prairie
4420 6    Haltom City
4421 6    Harlingen
4422 1    Houston
4423 6    Hurst
4424 2    Irving
4425 6    Killeen
4426 6    Kingsville
4427 5    Laredo
4428 6    Longview
4429 5    Lubbock
4451 6    Lufkin *
4430 6    Mcallen
4431 2    Mesquite
4432 5    Midland
4452 6    Nocogdoches *
4453 2    North Richland Hills *
4433 5    Odessa
4454 6    Paris *
4434 2    Pasadena
4455 2    Plano *
4435 5    Port Arthur
4436 2    Richardson
4437 5    San Angelo
4438 4    San Antonio
4439 6    Sherman
4440 6    Temple
4441 6    Texarkana
4442 6    Texas City
4443 5    Tyler
4444 6    Victoria
4445 5    Waco
4446 5    Wichita Falls

UTAH  (167)
4500 6    Bountiful
4501 6    East Millcreek
4506 6    Logan *
4507 6    Murray *
4502 5    Ogden
4503 6    Orem
4504 5    Provo
4505 5    Salt Lake City
4508 6    Sandy City *
4509 6    West Jordan *
4510 6    West Valley *

VERMONT  (106)
4600 6    Burlington

VIRGINIA  (140)
4700 2    Alexandria
4701 2    Annandale
4702 2    Arlington
4718 2    Blacksburg *
4719 2    Burke *
4703 6    Charlottesville
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4704</td>
<td>Chesapeake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4720</td>
<td>Dale City *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4705</td>
<td>Danville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4706</td>
<td>Hampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4707</td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4708</td>
<td>Lynchburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4721</td>
<td>Mclean *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4709</td>
<td>Newport News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4710</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4711</td>
<td>Petersburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4712</td>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4722</td>
<td>Reston *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4713</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4714</td>
<td>Roanoke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4715</td>
<td>Staunton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4723</td>
<td>Suffolk *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4724</td>
<td>Tuckahoe *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4716</td>
<td>Virginia Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4725</td>
<td>West Springfield *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4717</td>
<td>Woodbridge-Marumsco</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WASHINGTON (173)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4815</td>
<td>Auburn *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4800</td>
<td>Bellevue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4801</td>
<td>Bellingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4802</td>
<td>Bremerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4803</td>
<td>Edmonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4804</td>
<td>Everett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4805</td>
<td>Fort Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4816</td>
<td>Kennewick *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4806</td>
<td>Lakes District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4807</td>
<td>Longview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4817</td>
<td>Olympia *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4808</td>
<td>Renton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4809</td>
<td>Richland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4810</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4811</td>
<td>Spokane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4812</td>
<td>Tacoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4813</td>
<td>Vancouver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4818</td>
<td>Walla Walla *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4814</td>
<td>Yakima</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WEST VIRGINIA (156)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4900</td>
<td>Charleston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4901</td>
<td>Fairmont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4902</td>
<td>Huntington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4903</td>
<td>Morgantown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4904</td>
<td>Parkersburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4905</td>
<td>Weirton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4906</td>
<td>Wheeling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WISCONSIN (125)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td>Appleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5001</td>
<td>Beloit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5002</td>
<td>Brookfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5003</td>
<td>Eau Claire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5004</td>
<td>Fond Du Lac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5005</td>
<td>Green Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5006</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5007 6  Janesville
5008 5  Kenosha
5009 5  La Crosse
5010 5  Madison
5011 6  Manitowoc
5012 2  Menomonee Falls
5013 4  Milwaukee
5014 2  New Berlin
5015 5  Oshkosh
5016 5  Racine
5017 6  Sheboygan
5018 6  Superior
5019 2  Waukesha
5020 6  Wausau
5021 2  Wauwatosa
5022 2  West Allis

WYOMING (168)
5100 6  Casper
5101 6  Cheyenne

>> MASTER CODE
CPS 2-DIGIT OCCUPATION CODE (1996)

1980 Census Book
Reference Code

PROFESSIONAL, TECHNICAL AND KINDRED WORKERS (023-024, 026-027, 034, 035-036, 038-234)

10. Physicians -- medical, psychiatric and osteopathic; dentists (084, 085)

11. Other medical and paramedical (except health technicians -- see 16:) chiropractors, optometrists (086-089, 095-106)
chiropractors, optometrists, pharmacists, veterinarians, dieticians, registered nurses, etc.

12. Accountants; Auditors (023)

13. Teachers, except college (155-159)

14. Teachers, college; social scientists; librarians (113-154, 164-173)

15. Architects; chemists; engineers; physical and biological scientists (043-059, 069-078)

16. Technicians: computer programmers and analysts; health, engineering, science, and other technicians; designers; radio and television announcers; dental hygienists, practical nurses, etc. (063-068, 083,185, 189, 203-208)

17. Public advisors: personnel and labor relations workers (026, 027, 034, clergy and other religious workers, social and recreation workers, editors and reporters, public relations persons, etc. 174-177, 195, 197)
18. Judges; lawyers (178, 179)

19. Other professional, technical, and kindred workers (024, 183, 184, 186-188, 193, 193, 194, 198, 199)

MANAGERS, OFFICIALS, AND PROPRIETORS (EXCEPT FARM) (003-019, 025, 028-033, 037, 243)

20. Not self-employed; employee of own corporation (003-019, 025, 028-033, 037, 243)

31. Self-employed -- unincorporated businesses (003-019, 025, 028-033, 037, 243)

CLERICAL AND KINDRED WORKERS (303-389)

40. Secretaries, stenographers, typists (313-315)

41. Other clerical workers: bank tellers, bookkeepers, estimators and investigators, mail carriers, payroll and postal clerks, shipping and receiving clerks, stock clerks, etc. (303-309, 316-389)

SALES WORKERS (253-285)

45. Demonstrators, hucksters and peddlers, insurance and real estate agents and brokers, sales representatives and sales clerks, cashiers, etc. (253-285)

CRAFTSMEN, FOREMEN AND KINDRED WORKERS (413-424, 485, 494, 503-699, 805, 843, 863)

50. Foremen, not elsewhere classifiable, except craft (485, 494, 803, 843, 863)

51. Craftsmen, craft foremen and supervisors (503-699)

52. Government protective service workers: firemen, guards, policemen, etc. (413-424)

OPERATIVES AND KINDRED WORKERS (703-859)

61. Transport equipment operatives: bus drivers, conductors, deliverymen and routemen, fork lift and tow motor operatives, taxicab drivers, truck drivers, etc. (804-859)

62. Operatives, except transport (703-799)

LABORERS AND FARM FOREMEN (477-499, 864-889)

70. Unskilled laborers -- non-farm (864-889)
71. Farm laborers and foremen (477-499)

SERVICE WORKERS (403-407, 425-427, 433-469)

73. Private household workers (403-407)

75. Other service workers: maids, cleaners, janitors, bartenders, cooks, waiters, nursing aides, barbers, babysitters, (except 73), beauticians, etc. (425-427, 433-469)

FARMERS AND FARM MANAGERS (473-476)

80. Farmers (owners and tenants) and farm managers (473-476)

MISCELLANEOUS GROUPS

55. Members of armed forces (900)

MASTER CODE RELIGIOUS IDENTIFICATION

Codes followed by [1996] have been newly added in 1996. Codes followed by [1994] were added in 1994.

GENERAL PROTESTANT

010. Protestant, no denomination given
020. Non-denominational Protestant
040. Inter-denominational Protestant
099. Christian (NFS); "just Christian"

ADVENTIST

100. 7th Day Adventist
109. Adventist (NFS)

ANGLICAN

110. Episcopalian; Anglican
111. Independent Anglican, Episcopalian [1994]

BAPTIST

120. American Baptist Association
121. American Baptist Churches U.S.A. (inaccurately known as "Northern Baptist")
122. Baptist Bible Fellowship
123. Baptist General Conference
124. Baptist Missionary Association of America
125. Conservative Baptist Association of America
126. General Association of Regular Baptist Churches (G.A.R.B.)
127. National Association of Free Will Baptists (United Free Will Baptist Church)
128. Primitive Baptists
129. National Baptist Convention in the U.S.A.
130. National Baptist Convention of America
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>National Primitive Baptist Convention of the U.S.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Progressive National Baptist Convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Reformed Baptist (Calvinist)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Southern Baptist Convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Fundamental Baptist (no denom. ties)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Local (independent) Baptist churches with no denominational ties or links to a national fellowship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Baptist (NFS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONGREGATIONAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>United Church of Christ (includes Congregational, Evangelical and Reformed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Congregational Christian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EUROPEAN FREE CHURCH (ANABAPTISTS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Church of the Brethren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Brethren (NFS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Mennonite Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Moravian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Old Order Amish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Quakers (Friends)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Evangelical Covenant Church (not Anabaptist in tradition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Evangelical Free Church (not Anabaptist in tradition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Brethren in Christ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Mennonite Brethren</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HOLINESS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Christian and Missionary Alliance (CMA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Church of God (Anderson, IN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Church of the Nazarene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>Free Methodist Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>Salvation Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>Wesleyan Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>Church of God of Findlay, OH [1994]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Holiness (NFS); Church of God (NFS); R not or NA whether R Pentecostal or Charismatic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INDEPENDENT-FUNDAMENTALIST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Plymouth Brethren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Independent Fundamentalist Churches of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>Independent-Fundamentalist (NFS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LUTHERAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (formerly Lutheran Church in America and The American Lutheran Church); ELCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod; LC-MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod; WELS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>Other Conservative Lutheran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>Lutheran (NFS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
METHODIST

230. United Methodist Church; Evangelical United Brethren
231. African Methodist Episcopal Church
232. African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church
233. Christian Methodist Episcopal Church
234. Primitive Methodist [1994]
240. Congregational Methodist (fundamentalist)*
249. Methodist (NFS)

PENTECOSTAL

250. Assemblies of God
251. Church of God (Cleveland, TN)
252. Church of God (Huntsville, AL)
253. International Church of the Four Square Gospel
124. Baptist Missionary Association of America
125. Conservative Baptist Association of America
126. General Association of Regular Baptist Churches (G.A.R.B.)
127. National Association of Free Will Baptists (United Free Will Baptist Church)
128. Primitive Baptists
129. National Baptist Convention in the U.S.A.
130. National Baptist Convention of America
131. National Primitive Baptist Convention of the U.S.A.
132. Progressive National Baptist Convention
134. Reformed Baptist (Calvinist)
135. Southern Baptist Convention
147. Fundamental Baptist (no denom. ties)
148. Local (independent) Baptist churches with no denominational ties or links to a national fellowship
149. Baptist (NFS)

CONGREGATIONAL

150. United Church of Christ (includes Congregational, Evangelical and Reformed)
155. Congregational Christian

EUROPEAN FREE CHURCH (ANABAPTISTS)

160. Church of the Brethren
161. Brethren (NFS)
162. Mennonite Church
163. Moravian Church
164. Old Order Amish
165. Quakers (Friends)
166. Evangelical Covenant Church (not Anabaptist in tradition)
167. Evangelical Free Church (not Anabaptist in tradition)
168. Brethren in Christ
170. Mennonite Brethren

HOLINESS
Christian and Missionary Alliance (CMA)
Church of God (Anderson, IN)
Church of the Nazarene
Free Methodist Church
Salvation Army
Wesleyan Church
Church of God of Findlay, OH
Holiness (NFS); Church of God (NFS); R not or NA whether R Pentecostal or Charismatic

INDEPENDENT-FUNDAMENTALIST

Plymouth Brethren
Independent Fundamentalist Churches of America
Independent-Fundamentalist (NFS)

LUTHERAN

Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (formerly Lutheran Church in America and The American Lutheran Church); ELCA
Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod; LC-MS
Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod; WELS
Other Conservative Lutheran
Lutheran (NFS)

METHODIST

United Methodist Church; Evangelical United Brethren
African Methodist Episcopal Church
African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church
Christian Methodist Episcopal Church
 Primitive Methodist
Congregational Methodist (fundamentalist)* [1996]
Methodist (NFS)

PENTECOSTAL

Assemblies of God
Church of God (Cleveland, TN)
Church of God (Huntsville, AL)
International Church of the Four Square Gospel
Pentecostal Church of God
Pentecostal Holiness Church
United Pentecostal Church International
Church of God in Christ (incl. NA whether 258)
Church of God in Christ (International)
Church of God of the Apostolic Faith
Church of God of Prophecy
Vineyard Fellowship [1994]
Apostolic Pentecostal
Spanish Pentecostal
Pentecostal (NFS); Church of God (NFS); R not or NA whether R Pentecostal or Charismatic

PRESBYTERIAN

Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.
271. Cumberland Presbyterian Church
272. Presbyterian Church in America (PCA)
275. Evangelical Presbyterian
276. Reformed Presbyterian [1994]
279. Presbyterian (NFS)

**REFORMED**

280. Christian Reformed Church (inaccurately known as "Dutch Reformed")
281. Reformed Church in America
282. Free Hungarian Reformed Church
289. Reformed (NFS)

**RESTORATIONIST**

290. Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)
291. Christian Churches and Churches of Christ
292. Churches of Christ; "Church of Christ" (NFS)
293. Christian Congregation

**NON-TRADITIONAL PROTESTANTS**

300. Christian Scientists
301. Mormons; Latter Day Saints
302. Spiritualists
303. Unitarian; Universalist
304. Jehovah's Witnesses
305. Unity; Unity Church; Christ Church Unity
306. Fundamentalist Adventist (Worldwide Church of God)
309. Non-traditional Protestant (NFS)

**ROMAN CATHOLIC**

400. Roman Catholic

**JEISH**

500. Jewish, no preference
501. Orthodox
502. Conservative
503. Reformed

**EASTERN ORTHODOX (GREEK RITE CATHOLIC)**

700. Greek Rite Catholic
701. Greek Orthodox
702. Russian Orthodox
703. Rumanian Orthodox
704. Serbian Orthodox
705. Syrian Orthodox
706. Armenian Orthodox
707. Georgian Orthodox
708. Ukranian Orthodox
719. Eastern Orthodox (NFS)

**NON-CHRISTIAN/NON-JEISH**

720. Muslim; Mohammedan; Islam
Buddhist
Hindu
Bahai
American Indian Religions (Native American Religions)
Other non-Christian/non-Jewish
Religious/ethical cults

OTHER

Agnostics
Atheists
Other

Contact issue (1997 Pilot)

Codes below were used for "what was the issue involved" follow-ups to contact with six categories of public officials and two questions on mobilization via direct mail and mass media advertising. Codes were applied for up to 3 mentions each:

Health and Social Welfare
01. Social Security, saving Social Security. Help to get benefits. (All mentions of aid to the elderly except Medicaid.); Aged/Elderly mentions; retirement.
02. Medicaid/Medicare issues; saving the Medicare system.
03. Veterans Administration; benefits/issues. Getting help from the VA.
04. Welfare; getting public assistance; food stamps.
05. Availability of Medical Care; need for national health insurance; health issues.
06. Drugs; efforts against the spread of drugs; war on drugs.
07. Smoking/tobacco issues. Regulation of the industry; taxes on cigarettes. Support for the tobacco industry.
09. Abortion rights; pro partial-birth abortions; from Planned Parenthood.
10. Womens rights; ERA; equal pay in the workplace.
11. Gay/Lesbian rights.
12. Religious issues; religious rights or freedom.
13. Minority issues; affirmative action; minority rights.
14. Childrens issues; childrens welfare; child abuse; programs for at risk youth.
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15. Rights of the disabled/handicapped.

Economic/Employment Issues

20. Budget deficit; government spending; the Balanced Budget Amendment.

21. Taxes; taxes are too high; Tax credit for children/family. Tuition tax credits.

22. Deregulation of business/industry; airline, banking, telephone. Keeping prices low through competition. Anti-trust mentions; taxes on a specific industry (non-tobacco).

23. Unions; power and stature of unions (all mentions); labor issues; strikes.

24. Employment; how hard it is to find a job.

25. Work related; having to do with ones own job/business/industry.

26. Housing affordability; ability to get a mortgage.

Other Specific Issues

40. Environmental; ecology; pollution.

41. Rapid transit.

42. Immigration; against foreigners taking jobs or being on welfare, etc.

43. English as national/state language.

44. Gun control. Brady Bill mentions; from the NRA.

45. Burning Flags; desecrating the flag.

46. Farm issues (all mentions).

47. Natural disaster relief. Help/aid from floods, hurricanes, etc.

48. Television content; what's on TV; harmful to young minds; children having access to the Internet.

49. Foreign Policy (all mentions). Foreign aid; international. All nations or hotspots; NAFTA; foreign trade; being in the UN.

50. Military/defense matters. Weapons; military budget (too much or too little).

51. Term limits.

52. Fine art funding.

53. Prayer in school.

54. Animal rights.

55. Police protection/Public Safety.
57. Casinos/gambling. The Indian casino.
58. Funding of money to city/state from federal government (NA what for).
59. Mandates to cities/states without funding (NA what for).

Primarily Local Issues
70. Budgets; spending concerns (local only).
71. Education; need for better schools. (All mentions except sex education).
72. Sex education.
73. Local ordinances; signs, zoning, drainage, land use; growth management; Beautification laws; residency laws for employment.
74. Taxes (local level only). School or property taxes.
75. Better roads/ local infrastructure.
76. Community problems or issues- NA what. Community affairs.
77. Car insurance rates.
78. Tolls on freeways.
79. Local legislation; bill being passed (NA what).

Miscellaneous
90. Voting Record; what politician has done in the past (NA what).
91. For a flag; one that has flown over the Capitol.
92. Tour tickets; information on tourism.
93. Just to talk; touch base with representative or politician (NA on what).
94. Issues/topics (NA what). Unspecified. Current events.; or invitation to contact elected official; giving input (NA what); all mentions of surveys and questionnaires.
95. Elections/voting/campaigns; getting out the vote, (no issues mentioned).
96. Appointments made; (comments on individuals appointed.)
97. OTHER

>> MASTER CODE
GOVERNMENT WASTE (1997)
General


02. Building projects (without mention of political deal making). Roads, infrastructure.

03. Overspending in general. Waste in general. (If say government or similar term code as government operations.)

Social Welfare Programs; Education

10. Medicare or Medicaid. Medical assistance to the needy.


12. Education (all mentions). Student loans; aid to education.

13. Housing/Urban Development. Housing assistance or subsidies.


15. Affirmative Action/Minority rights programs.


17. Programs for Children.

Other Specific Programs

20. Environmental programs, ecology, protecting nature, fighting pollution.

21. Space Projects. NASA. Putting things in space.

22. Funding for the Arts, PBS, NEA funding.

23. Research, studies, experiments (all mentions).

24. Farm subsidies; including the tobacco industry.

25. Prisoners (paying them); cost of incarceration.

26. Illegal immigrants; supporting them, giving them assistance.

27. Policies/Programs (NA what, but not social programs); subsidies (NA what).

28. War on drugs.

29. Law enforcement. War on crime, (all mentions non-drug related).

30. Taxes (all mentions).

Government Operations

51. Salaries; they get paid too much; giving themselves a raise.

52. Travel/junkets/perks (too many/too expensive). Eating out, limousines, luxuries, etc; pensions.

53. Cost of elections.


55. Land management (with regard to mining, timber, cattle or other interests taking Advantage of the government).

Defense; Foreign Affairs

60. Foreign aid, give away too much, take care of problems at home first.

61. Defense spending; spending on weapons; military budget is too high.

Miscellaneous

70. Too much partying; socializing; celebrating.


72. What lobbyists/special interests want. (All mentions of waste because of lobbying or outside political pressure.)

73. Entitlements (no further explanations).

74. Corruption/Kickbacks/Patronage jobs. (All mentions of a criminal nature.)

75. Political Party fundraising. Fundraising.

97. Other >> MASTER CODE

GROUP REFERENCES (1997 Pilot)

1997 C1/C1a GROUPS ('GROUPS THAT ARE LIKE R')

--------

RELIGION

--------

-CONSERVATIVE CHRISTIANS
10 Christian Coalition
11 Conservative Christian
12 Evangelicals; Evangelical Presbyterian church groups; Evangelical ministers
13 Born Again Christians

-CHRISTIANS (NO FURTHER SPECIFICATION)
14 Christians; Christian people; Judeo-Christian beliefs; Christian families; Groups that believe in Christian value; Christian groups that believe the second coming is coming soon; Non-evangelical Christian
See Also: 15 American Christians
16 Liberal Christian
17 Christian Friends
-OTHER CHRISTIANS
19 (Other Protestants); Lutherans; Unitarian church; Protestant; Quakers
See Also: 20 White Protestants
21 Catholics

-OTHER RELIGIOUS GROUPS
22 Jews
23 Pagans

-OTHER REFERENCES TO RELIGION OR CHURCH
25 (People in R's Church); Church friends; People that are in my church; People that go to my parish
26 Church Group; Church groups; Church
(Note: This category differs from 25 in that R does not specifically state that the church group or church is R's own.)
27 (Other References to Religion or Church, no further specification); Religion groups; Church people; People of faith; People that go to church; The Church

--
CLASS / INCOME
--

-UPPER MIDDLE CLASS
30 Upper Middle Class; Affluent; Medium to upper income

-MIDDLE CLASS
31 Middle Class; Financial the middle; Medium class; Middle income type of people; Middle class citizens; Middle class society
See Also: 32 Middle Class America
33 Middle Class Whites
34 Middle Class White Americans

-WORKING MIDDLE CLASS
36 Working Middle Class people; Middle class working
See Also: 37 Middle Class Working Americans
38 Middle-Class Blue Collar Group; Upper blue collar middle class

-LOWER MIDDLE CLASS
39 Lower Middle Class; Lower middle income.

-WORKING CLASS / WORKING PEOPLE
40 Working Class; Working public; The working people; People that work everyday; Wage earners; The common worker; Normal everyday working group
See Also: 41 Working Class Females
42 Working American
43 Middle Age Working Class America
126 Working parents
127 Working couples where both work outside of the home
130 Working mother
161 Blue Collar Workers

-POOR PEOPLE
44 Poor People; People with low incomes; People with modest income; Underclass; Lower income; People without a whole lot of money
45 (People on welfare)

-OTHER REFERENCES TO ECONOMIC STATUS
46 (Same income as R)
47 People Well paid
48 Homeowners
49 Taxpayers; Frustrated taxpayers; Taxpayers' association

--

POLITICAL IDEOLOGY / PARTISANSHIP
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-PARTY IDENTIFICATION
  50 Conservative Republicans; Right wing Republican
  51 Republicans; The Republican Party
  52 Moderate Republicans; Weak Republicans; Republican, but I don't
  agree with everything they say so I'm not strictly Republican
  53 Conservative Democrat
  54 Moderate Democrats
  55 Democrats; Clinton supporters
  56 Other Party References; The responsibility party; Independent
  party; Independents

-IDEOLOGICAL IDENTIFICATION
  57 Conservatives; Anyone who would have conservative ideas
  See Also: 58 White Conservative
  59 Moderate Conservatives,
  60 Moderates; I'm in the middle of the road; Not people with strong
  ideology
  61 Less Conservative
  62 Moderate Liberal; Somewhat liberal
  63 Liberal

-OTHER POLITICAL IDENTIFICATIONS
  64 Angry White Male
  65 The KKK, Christian Militia
  66 Pro gun rights; NRA
  67 Pro-life
  68 Pro-choice
  69 Feminist
  70 Environmentalist; People interested in saving the different
  species of animals in rain forests...; Green party; conservation;
  Not polluting the air or environment; People that try to clean up
  the environment
  71 Labor Unions; Trade unionist; Organized labor
  73 (Political Participant); Activist; Trying to get involved; People
  who are trying to make a difference in their own small way;
  Volunteers; Supporters of causes
  74 (General Reference to Political Groups, no further specification);
  Sometimes in social activities we speak about politics; Political
  75 (Apolitical); People who don't care much about politics; Not
  political involved; People who are somewhat jaded by the way things
  are right now
  76 (Patriot); People who care about the country

---

AGE
---

-YOUNG
  80 Young People; Generation X; The 19-25 age group; People who are
  25-30
  See Also: 116 Caucasian Young Females
  121 Young Marieds
  124 Young Parents

-MIDDLE AGE
  81 Middle Age; Baby Boomers; The yuppie-type age people between
  35-45; The hippy generation; People in the forties, like my daughter
  See Also: 43 Middle age Working Class America
  102 Middle Aged Caucasians
  112 Middle Aged White Males

-OLDER
  82 (Pre-Boomers); 50 Something; Over age 55
  See Also: 115 50-Something Women
Page 375
83 Senior Citizens; Seniors; Older people; Elderly; Anyone who graduated from high schools in the 1930s
   See Also: 84 White Elderly Population
             85 Older White Americans
             86 Senior Community Complex
87 Retired people; AARP; People concerned with pensions

-OTHER REFERENCE TO AGE
88 (Same age as R)

---------
EDUCATION
---------
91 Less educated people; Not highly educated but not dumb
92 College groups; College students
93 Recent college graduates; Recent grads; Younger college educated people
94 Well-educated people; Educated; College educated; College grads; highly educated
95 (General reference to school and education); Students; Working to get education; School; Education
96 (Education-related issues); Education is very important; People interested in Education; Friends of education; PTA's; People interested in the schools

----------------
RACE / ETHNICITY
----------------
100 Whites.
   See Also: 20 White Protestants
             33 Middle Class Whites
             34 Middle Class White Americans
             58 White Conservative
             64 Angry White Male
             84 White Elderly Population
             85 Older White Americans
             101 Anglo Saxon White Americans
             102 Middle aged Caucasians
             103 Anglo Saxon
             104 Irish
             111 Caucasian Males
             112 Middle Aged White Males
             116 Caucasian Young Females
105 African Americans; Afro-Americans; Black
106 Hispanics; Latinos
107 (Asian Americans); The Asian Community
108 Native Americans
109 (Other References to Race); Multiracial

---------------------
GENDER / SEXUAL ORIENTATION
---------------------
-GENDER / SEXUAL ORIENTATION
110 Men
   See Also: 64 Angry White Male
             111 Caucasian Males
             112 Middle Aged White Males
113 Women
   See Also: 18 Christian Women
             41 Working class females
             114 Working Women; Professional working women; Career women
             115 50-Something Women; Women 45-50; Older women;
Women in menopause in their 50s
116 Caucasian Young Females
132 Single women
151 Business Women

117 Gay

FAMILY

-FAMILY

 Married
See Also: 121 Young Marrieds
122 Married Families
163 Housewife

 Parents; People with families; Family groups; Couples who have children and families
See Also: 122 Married Families
124 Young Parents; Young couples with children; Parents of school age children
125 Parents that take time off work to work with their kids
126 Working parents
128 Single Parents
129 Mothers
130 Working mother
131 Single mothers
127 Working couples where both work outside of the home; Couples where both people work
132 Single women

-OTHER REFERENCES TO FAMILY

 R's Family; Family members; My children
134 People who are family-oriented; Focus on the families

OCCUPATION

-PROFESSIONALS / MEDIA / TECHNOLOGY / BUSINESS

140 Professionals; Professional people with college education
141 White Collar Worker
142 Doctors
143 Engineers
144 Teachers; Professors; Educators
145 Entertainers and artists
146 News Commentators
147 Politicians
148 Technology Groups
149 Technical People; Professional technical people; Technical people with advanced degrees
150 Business People; People in the business world; Businessmen; Business groups; Chamber of Commerce; Business owners; Investors; Entrepreneurs
See also: 151 Business Women
152 Small Businessperson; Small independent businessman
153 People in Real Estate
154 Salespeople

-LAW ENFORCEMENT / FARMERS / CONSTRUCTION / BLUE COLLAR

155 Criminal Justice People
156 Farmers
157 Construction Workers
Truck Driver; People that make their living on the highway
Railroad
Military Personnel
Blue Collar Workers; High paid blue collar worker

See Also: 38 Middle-Class Blue Collar Group

-OTHER OCCUPATION REFERENCE
Self-employed
Housewife
Peace Corp volunteer

GEOGRAPHY

Neighbors; My neighborhood; People in the neighborhood
Rural; Rural area people; The country people
Urban; The city; Inner city person
Suburban
(Reference to a State); Texans
People in my Community

See Also: 86 Senior Community Complex

-AMERICANS
(Reference to America or Americans); Middle American; Americans in general

See Also: 15 American Christians
32 Middle Class America
34 Middle Class White Americans
37 Middle Class Working Americans
42 Working American.
43 Middle age Working Class America
85 Older White Americans
101 Anglo Saxon White Americans

HOBBIES / ACTIVITIES / SPORTS

(Media-related Interests); Those who listen to radio part time; Newspaper readers; People who listen to public radio; NPR
(Reading-related Interests); Readers of science fiction; Interested in reading, fiction reading mainly; Literary group (like friends of the library)
(Sports Activities or Fans); Ohio State Football Fan; Golfing league; Bowling; Eastern Stars camping group; Sporting groups, hunting and fishing
(Arts-related Interests); Actively involved in the theater; Music and theater; People who are interested in the arts
(Other group activities); Masonic Fraternity; Health (food groups); Woman's club group; Luncheon groups; Men's group; Cooking groups; Veterans group that is non political
(Traveling); World travelers

PEOPLE R HAS CONTACT WITH

Friends; Close friends

See Also: 17 Christian friends.
Co-workers; People that I work [with]; My office mate
(Other Contact references); People I associate with; People I come in contact with day by day; Most people you deal with; I'm comfortable with everybody I talk to, I can talk to the highest and lowest in life, doesn't make any difference to me; People that I talk to from all age groups and financial backgrounds
PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES

200  Hard-working / Financially motivated; People who have had a rough
time in life, really worked for what they have; People who want a
high quality of life; Trying to get out of welfare; The ones that
work hard but get little reward in the end
201  Independent thinkers; Rugged individualist
202  Realists; More down to earth
203  Optimists; People that try to have a positive attitude toward life;
Positive thinking group
204  People with morals; Traditional
205  (Other Personal Attributes); Open-minded people; Easy-going;
Creative; Artistic; Caring; Honest people; Well-informed intelligent
people

OTHER

210  Average / Common Person; Plain down to earth person; Joe average;
Just everyday people; Middle group; Just regular people like me
220  Many Groups or People; A lot of groups; About half the people...most
of the people
230  None, No groups.
998  Don't Know.
999  No Answer, Refused.