

APPENDICES

>> Study Design, Content, and Administration 1992 PRE-POST

STUDY DESIGN

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
documentation for V3008, V3009, and V7000, for further information.

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;

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
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.

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

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

Panel Respondents					
Mode	Questionnaire	Pre-Election		Post-Election	
Face-to-face (A)	Full	1155	84.8%	951	76.1%
Phone (B)	Short	149	11.0%	186	14.9%
Phone	Full	57	4.2%	113	9.0%
Subtotal		1361	100.0%	1250	100.0%
Cross Section Respondents					
Mode	Questionnaire	Pre-Election		Post-Election	
Face-to-face (C)	Full	1053	93.6%	830	82.6%
Phone (D)	Short	5	.4%	4	.4%
Phone	Full	68	6.0%	171	17.0%
Subtotal		1126	100.0%	1005	100.0%
Total Respondents					
Mode	Questionnaire	Pre-Election		Post-Election	
Face-to-face	Full	2208	88.8%	1781	79.0%
Phone	Short	154	6.2%	190	8.4%
Phone	Full	125	5.0%	284	12.6%
Total		2487	100.0%	2255	100.0%

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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

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

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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

Response Rate:	71.4%
Length of Interview:	78.0 min
No. of Respondents:	2000

-

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

Nov. 07-Nov. 17	836	42%
Nov. 18-Dec. 01	594	72%
Dec. 02-Dec. 22	413	92%
Dec. 23-Jan. 05	106	97%
Jan. 06-Jan. 26	51	100%

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt 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.

[7] Text prepared by the Sampling Section of the Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, March, 1993.

[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.

[9] See Note 3.

[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.

[11] Based on field experience in 1986 NES study.

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

[13] Released to field October 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).

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

[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 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 the 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)

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
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)

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
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,
V9\7291, 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.

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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 -election study is, by definition, eligible for a reinterview. (1992 respondents who were interviewed in the Pre-election 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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
report of this debriefing is included in Appendix A.

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.

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

Documentation and dataset are available through the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. ICPSR User Services may be contacted by phone (313.763- 5010) or by Internet E-Mail (icpsr_netmail@um.cc.umich.edu) for further information.

□>> 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'

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

- * 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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

- * certainty probe on liberal-conservative scale;
self and other objects

NOTES ON SURVEY ADMINISTRATION FOR 1992, 1993 AND 1994 STUDIES

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

1994 Post Election

	N	Resp. Rate
X-Section	1036	72.1%
Panel	759	77.0%
Overall	1795	74.1%

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.

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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.

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
Data and Documentation

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.

STUDY CONTENT AND SUBSTANTIVE THEMES

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 self-placements ("How certain are you of your 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.

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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 Congressperson 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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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:

Replicate	Date of release
1	September 3, 1996
2	September 12, 1996
3	September 26, 1996
4	October 10, 1996
5 (Reserve)	September 26, 1996 (with replicate 3)
6 (Reserve)	October 10, 1996 (with replicate 4)

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)

RELEASE	Total	Panel	Cross-section
1	28%	28%	18%
2	27	27	24
3+5	23	23	23

Table 2: Percent Completions by two week period (pre-election survey)

DATES	Total	Panel	Cross-section
9/3-9/16	19%	20%	18%
9/17-10/1	24	24	22
10/2-10/16	23	23	23
10/17-10/30	24	24	26
10/31-11/4	10	10	12

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

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

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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:

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

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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.

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.

□>> 1996 - ACCESSING GROUP-SPECIFIC DATA

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

V961360 5844-5847
V961361 5848-5851
V961361A 5852
V961361B 5853
V961361C 5854
V961361D 5855
V961362 5856-5859
V961362A 5860
V961362B 5861
V961362C 5862
V961362D 5863
V961363 5864-5867
V961363A 5868
V961363B 5869
V961363C 5870
V961363D 5871
V961364 5872
V961365 5873-5876
V961366 5877-5880
V961366A 5881
V961366B 5882
V961366C 5883
V961366D 5884
V961367 5885-5888
V961367A 5889
V961367B 5890
V961367C 5891
V961367D 5892
V961368 5893-5896
V961368A 5897
V961368B 5898
V961368C 5899
V961368D 5900
V961369 5901
V961370 5902-5905
V961371 5906-5909
V961371A 5910
V961371B 5911
V961371C 5912
V961371D 5913
V961372 5914-5917
V961372A 5918
V961372B 5919
V961372C 5920
V961372D 5921
V961373 5922-5925
V961373A 5926
V961373B 5927
V961373C 5928
V961373D 5929
V961374 5930
V961375 5931-5934
V961376 5935-5938
V961376A 5939
V961376B 5940
V961376C 5941
V961376D 5942
V961377 5943-5946
V961377A 5947

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

V961377B 5948
V961377C 5949
V961377D 5950
V961378 5951-5954
V961378A 5955
V961378B 5956
V961378C 5957
V961378D 5958
V961379 5959
V961380 5960-5963
V961381 5964-5967
V961381A 5968
V961381B 5969
V961381C 5970
V961381D 5971
V961382 5972-5975
V961382A 5976
V961382B 5977
V961382C 5978
V961382D 5979
V961383 5980-5983
V961383A 5984
V961383B 5985
V961383C 5986
V961383D 5987
V961384 5988
V961385 5989-5992
V961386 5993-5996
V961386A 5997
V961386B 5998
V961386C 5999
V961386D 6000
V961387 6001-6004
V961387A 6005
V961387B 6006
V961387C 6007
V961387D 6008
V961388 6009-6012
V961388A 6013
V961388B 6014
V961388C 6015
V961388D 6016
V961389 6017
V961390 6018-6021
V961391 6022-6025
V961391A 6026
V961391B 6027
V961391C 6028
V961391D 6029
V961392 6030-6033
V961392A 6034
V961392B 6035
V961392C 6036
V961392D 6037
V961393 6038-6041
V961393A 6042
V961393B 6043
V961393C 6044
V961393D 6045

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

V961394 6046
V961395 6047-6050
V961396 6051-6054
V961396A 6055
V961396B 6056
V961396C 6057
V961396D 6058
V961397 6059-6062
V961397A 6063
V961397B 6064
V961397C 6065
V961397D 6066
V961398 6067-6070
V961398A 6071
V961398B 6072
V961398C 6073
V961398D 6074
V961399 6075
V961400 6076-6079
V961401 6080-6083
V961401A 6084
V961401B 6085
V961401C 6086
V961401D 6087
V961402 6088-6091
V961402A 6092
V961402B 6093
V961402C 6094
V961402D 6095
V961403 6096-6099
V961403A 6100
V961403B 6101
V961403C 6102
V961403D 6103
V961404 6104
V961405 6105-6108
V961406 6109-6112
V961406A 6113
V961406B 6114
V961406C 6115
V961406D 6116
V961407 6117-6120
V961407A 6121
V961407B 6122
V961407C 6123
V961407D 6124
V961408 6125-6128
V961408A 6129
V961408B 6130
V961408C 6131
V961408D 6132
V961409 6133
V961410 6134-6137
V961411 6138-6141
V961411A 6142
V961411B 6143
V961411C 6144
V961411D 6145
V961412 6146-6149

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

V961412A 6150
V961412B 6151
V961412C 6152
V961412D 6153
V961413 6154-6157
V961413A 6158
V961413B 6159
V961413C 6160
V961413D 6161
V961414 6162
V961415 6163-6166
V961416 6167-6170
V961416A 6171
V961416B 6172
V961416C 6173
V961416D 6174
V961417 6175-6178
V961417A 6179
V961417B 6180
V961417C 6181
V961417D 6182
V961418 6183-6186
V961418A 6187
V961418B 6188
V961418C 6189
V961418D 6190
V961419 6191
V961420 6192-6195
V961421 6196-6199
V961421A 6200
V961421B 6201
V961421C 6202
V961421D 6203
V961422 6204-6207
V961422A 6208
V961422B 6209
V961422C 6210
V961422D 6211
V961423 6212-6215
V961423A 6216
V961423B 6217
V961423C 6218
V961423D 6219
V961424 6220
V961425 6221-6224
V961426 6225-6228
V961426A 6229
V961426B 6230
V961426C 6231
V961426D 6232
V961427 6233-6236
V961427A 6237
V961427B 6238
V961427C 6239
V961427D 6240
V961428 6241-6244
V961428A 6245
V961428B 6246
V961428C 6247

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

V961428D 6248
V961429 6249
V961430 6250-6253
V961431 6254-6257
V961431A 6258
V961431B 6259
V961431C 6260
V961431D 6261
V961432 6262-6265
V961432A 6266
V961432B 6267
V961432C 6268
V961432D 6269
V961433 6270-6273
V961433A 6274
V961433B 6275
V961433C 6276
V961433D 6277
V961434 6278
V961435 6279-6282
V961436 6283-6286
V961436A 6287
V961436B 6288
V961436C 6289
V961436D 6290
V961437 6291-6294
V961437A 6295
V961437B 6296
V961437C 6297
V961437D 6298
V961438 6299-6302
V961438A 6303
V961438B 6304
V961438C 6305
V961438D 6306
V961439 6307
V961440 6308-6311
V961441 6312-6315
V961441A 6316
V961441B 6317
V961441C 6318
V961441D 6319
V961442 6320-6323
V961442A 6324
V961442B 6325
V961442C 6326
V961442D 6327
V961443 6328-6331
V961443A 6332
V961443B 6333
V961443C 6334
V961443D 6335
V961444 6336
V961445 6337-6340
V961446 6341-6344
V961446A 6345
V961446B 6346
V961446C 6347
V961446D 6348

V961447 6349-6352
V961447A 6353
V961447B 6354
V961447C 6355
V961447D 6356
V961448 6357-6360
V961448A 6361
V961448B 6362
V961448C 6363
V961448D 6364
V961449 6365
V961450 6366-6369
V961451 6370-6373
V961451A 6374
V961451B 6375
V961451C 6376
V961451D 6377
V961452 6378-6381
V961452A 6382
V961452B 6383
V961452C 6384
V961452D 6385
V961453 6386-6389
V961453A 6390
V961453B 6391
V961453C 6392
V961453D 6393

.....

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)

v961441c (0)
v961441d (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)

v961363d (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)

v961393c (0)
v961393d (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)

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

v961423b (0)
v961423c (0)
v961423d (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 =.;

v961453a (0)
v961453b (0)
v961453c (0)
v961453d (0)

□>> POST-STRATIFIED CROSS-SECTIONAL ANALYSIS WEIGHTS FOR THE
1992, 1994 AND 1996 NES DATA

Prepared by the Sampling Section Division of Surveys and Technologies
Survey Research Center
Institute for Social Research
University of Michigan

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 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).

Education	% reporting having voted
-----------	-----------------------------

No HS diploma	57.1
High school diploma	69.1
Some college	80.7
College Graduate	89.9
Total	76.6

Table 1b:

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

Age	% reporting having voted
18-21	54.6
22-29	59.2
30-39	73.3
40-49	80.7
50-59	81.0
60-69	81.8
70+	84.5
Total	76.6

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

	1992 CPS propor- tion	1992 pre (weighted)	1994 CPS propor- tion	1994 post (weighted)	1996 CPS propor- tion	1996 pre (weighted)
No HS Diploma	0.208	0.144	0.195	0.161	0.189	0.103
HS Diploma	0.355	0.321	0.339	0.356	0.332	0.338
Some College	0.243	0.270	0.264	0.258	0.264	0.323
College Graduate	0.195	0.265	0.203	0.226	0.215	0.236

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

		1992			1994		1996			
		(pre)		(post)	(post)		(pre)		(post)	
AGE	HIGHEST EDUCATION	n	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
18-21	No HS Diploma	7	7	100.0	7	100.0	5	71.4	3	42.9
	HS Diploma	30	27	90.0	18	60.0	11	36.7	6	20.0
	Some College	24	23	95.8	18	75.0	15	62.5	14	58.3
	College Graduate	1	1	100.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0
	TOTAL		62	58	93.5	44	71.0	31	50.0	23
22-29	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
30-39	No HS									

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

	Diploma	23	22	95.7	16	69.6	11	47.8	11	47.8
	HS Diploma	89	78	87.6	56	62.9	44	49.4	41	46.1
	Some									
	College	93	86	92.5	72	77.4	54	58.1	49	52.7
	College									
	Graduate	107	103	96.3	78	72.9	62	57.9	58	54.2
TOTAL		312	289	92.6	222	71.2	171	54.8	159	51.0
40-49	No HS									
	Diploma	13	13	100.0	9	69.2	6	46.2	5	38.5
	HS Diploma	52	48	92.3	35	67.3	28	53.8	24	46.2
	Some									
	College	48	40	83.3	27	56.3	21	43.8	20	41.7
	College									
	Graduate	70	62	88.6	50	71.4	41	58.6	38	54.3
TOTAL		183	163	89.1	121	66.1	96	52.5	87	47.5
50-59	No HS									
	Diploma	27	24	88.9	17	63.0	15	55.6	14	51.9
	HS Diploma	43	40	93.0	33	76.7	26	60.5	22	51.2
	Some									
	College	28	25	89.3	18	64.3	14	50.0	14	50.0
	College									
	Graduate	45	39	86.7	33	73.3	30	66.7	29	64.2
TOTAL		143	128	89.5	101	70.6	85	59.4	79	55.2
60-69	No HS									
	Diploma	37	30	81.1	23	62.2	17	45.9	16	43.2
	HS Diploma	50	39	78.0	30	60.0	24	48.0	24	48.0
	Some									
	College	19	14	73.7	10	52.6	9	47.4	9	47.4
	College									
	Graduate	16	16	100.0	13	81.3	12	75.0	11	68.8
TOTAL		122	99	81.1	76	62.3	62	50.8	60	49.2
70+	No HS									
	Diploma	54	42	77.8	28	51.9	22	40.7	21	38.9
	HS Diploma	31	30	96.8	22	71.0	15	48.4	14	45.2
	Some									
	College	27	24	88.9	20	74.1	16	59.3	14	51.9
	College									
	Graduate	19	16	84.2	15	78.9	12	63.2	10	52.6
TOTAL		131	112	85.5	85	64.9	65	49.6	59	45.0
		1126	1005		759		597		545	

Summary by Education level:

	1992 pre		1992 post		1994 post		1996 pre		1996 post	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
No HS										
Diploma	176	86.9	153	61.4	108	46.6	82	43.2	76	

HS Diploma	348	309	88.8	223	64.1	165	47.4	146	42.0
Some College	302	268	88.7	209	69.2	167	55.3	154	51.0
College graduate	300	275	91.7	219	73.0	183	61.0	169	56.3
Total	1126	1005	89.3	759	67.4	597	53.0	545	48.4

Table 3b: Cumulative attrition for the 1994 NES Cross-section sample

AGE (at 1994)	HIGHEST EDUCATION	1994 (post)		1996 (pre)		1996 (post)	
		n	n	%	n	%	
18-21	No HS						
	Diploma	13	8	61.5	4	30.8	
	HS Diploma	24	13	54.2	9	37.5	
	Some College	18	10	55.6	7	38.9	
	College Graduate	0	0		0		
TOTAL		55	31	56.4	20	36.4	
22-29	No HS						
	Diploma	14	6	42.9	4	28.6	
	HS Diploma	45	31	68.9	26	57.8	
	Some College	58	37	63.8	33	56.9	
	College Graduate	35	24	68.6	22	62.9	
TOTAL		152	98	64.5	85	55.9	
30-39	No HS						
	Diploma	21	16	76.2	13	61.9	
	HS Diploma	93	59	63.4	53	57.0	
	Some College	73	45	61.6	40	54.8	
	College Graduate	59	44	74.6	40	67.8	
TOTAL		246	164	66.7	146	59.3	
40-49	No HS						
	Diploma	14	10	71.4	8	57.1	
	HS Diploma	53	39	73.6	37	69.8	
	Some College	52	40	76.9	37	71.2	
	College Graduate	67	54	80.6	51	76.4	
TOTAL		186	143	76.9	133	71.5	
50-59	No HS						
	Diploma	16	11	68.8	10	62.5	
	HS Diploma	43	33	76.7	27	62.8	

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

	Some College	24	19	79.2	19	79.2
	College Graduate	29	21	72.4	21	72.4
TOTAL		112	84	75.0	77	68.8
60-69	No HS Diploma	42	30	71.4	28	66.7
	HS Diploma	62	42	67.7	40	64.5
	Some College	21	16	76.2	15	71.4
	College Graduate	19	17	89.5	17	89.5
TOTAL		144	105	72.9	100	69.4
70+	No HS Diploma	51	32	62.7	31	60.8
	HS Diploma	42	30	71.4	29	69.0
	Some College	22	12	54.5	11	50.0
	College Graduate	26	20	76.9	20	76.9
TOTAL		141	94	66.7	91	64.5
		1036	719		652	

Summary by Education level:

	1994 post		1996 pre		1996 post	
	n	n	%	n	%	
No HS Diploma	171	113	66.1	98	57.3	
HS Diploma	362	247	68.2	221	61.0	
Some College	268	179	66.8	162	60.4	
College Graduate	235	180	76.6	171	72.8	
Total	1036	719	69.4	652	62.9	

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

1996

AGE (at 1996)	HIGHEST EDUCATION	(pre)		(post)	
		n	n	%	%
18-21	No HS Diploma	3	2	66.7	
	HS Diploma	9	7	77.8	
	Some College	23	21	91.3	
	College Graduate	0	0		
TOTAL		35	30	85.7	
22-29	No HS Diploma	4	2	50.0	
	HS Diploma	19	13	72.2	

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

	Some College	13	10	76.9
	College Graduate	17	16	94.1
TOTAL		52	41	78.8
30-39	No HS Diploma	4	4	100.0
	HS Diploma	36	29	80.6
	Some College	31	29	93.5
	College Graduate	28	23	82.1
TOTAL		99	85	85.9
40-49	No HS Diploma	5	4	80.0
	HS Diploma	23	18	78.3
	Some College	25	20	80.0
	College Graduate	22	19	86.4
TOTAL		75	61	81.3
50-59	No HS Diploma	7	6	85.7
	HS Diploma	17	15	88.2
	Some College	17	15	88.2
	College Graduate	15	15	100.0
TOTAL		56	51	91.1
60-69	No HS Diploma	9	9	100.0
	HS Diploma	12	11	91.7
	Some College	9	7	77.8
	College Graduate	7	6	85.7
TOTAL		37	33	89.2
70+	No HS Diploma	13	10	76.9
	HS Diploma	22	18	81.8
	Some College	6	5	83.3
	College Graduate	3	3	100.0
TOTAL		44	36	81.8
		398	337	

Summary by Education level:

	1996 pre n	1996 post n	%
No HS Diploma	45	37	82.2
HS Diploma	137	111	81.0
Some College	124	107	86.3
College Graduate	92	82	89.1
Total	398	337	84.7

5. Construction of the new weights

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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

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

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:

Distribution of the 1992 NES Cross-section sample by current age and education

AGE	HIGHEST	1992	Unwtd	Wghted	Unwtd	Wghted
(Cur-	EDUCATION	CPS	n	%	n	%

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

rent)				(Sel, NR)		(Sel, NR)		
18-21	No College	4.3	37	3.3	4.6	34	3.4	4.7
	College	3.1	25	2.2	2.3	24	2.4	2.6
TOTAL		7.3	62	5.5	7.0	58	5.8	7.3
22-29	No HS							
	Diploma	2.4	15	1.3	1.6	15	1.5	1.8
	HS Diploma	6.1	53	4.7	4.5	47	4.7	4.6
	Some							
	College	4.8	63	5.6	5.6	56	5.6	5.6
	College							
	Graduate	3.5	42	3.7	3.7	38	3.8	3.8
TOTAL		16.7	173	15.4	15.4	156	15.5	15.8
30-39	No HS							
	Diploma	3.0	23	2.0	1.6	22	2.2	1.7
	HS Diploma	8.7	89	7.9	8.0	78	7.8	7.8
	Some							
	College	6.1	93	8.3	8.0	86	8.6	8.3
	College							
	Graduate	5.7	107	9.5	9.2	103	10.2	10.0
TOTAL		23.4	312	27.7	26.8	289	28.8	27.8
40-49	No HS							
	Diploma	2.4	13	1.2	1.2	13	1.3	1.3
	HS Diploma	6.1	52	4.6	5.1	48	4.8	5.2
	Some							
	College	4.7	48	4.3	4.7	40	4.0	4.2
	College							
	Graduate	5.0	70	6.2	6.3	62	6.2	6.2
TOTAL		18.1	183	16.3	17.2	163	16.2	16.9
50-59	No HS							
	Diploma	2.8	27	2.4	2.5	24	2.4	2.4
	HS Diploma	4.7	43	3.8	4.6	40	4.0	4.8
	Some							
	College	2.4	28	2.5	2.4	25	2.5	2.5
	College							
	Graduate	2.5	45	4.0	4.2	39	3.9	4.1
TOTAL		12.3	143	12.7	13.7	128	12.7	13.7
60-69	No HS							
	Diploma	3.5	37	3.3	3.0	30	3.0	2.7
	HS Diploma	4.2	50	4.4	4.0	39	3.9	3.5
	Some							
	College	1.8	19	1.7	1.8	14	1.4	1.4
	College							
	Graduate	1.7	16	1.4	1.5	16	1.6	1.7
TOTAL		11.1	122	10.8	10.2	99	9.9	9.3
70+	No HS							
	Diploma	4.8	54	4.8	3.8	42	4.2	3.1

HS Diploma	3.6	31	2.8	2.2	30	3.0	2.4
Some College	1.5	27	2.4	2.3	24	2.4	2.2
College Graduate	1.2	19	1.7	1.5	16	1.6	1.5
TOTAL	11.1	131	11.6	9.8	112	11.1	9.2
		1126			1005		

by Education Summary level:	1992 pre				1992 post			
	92 CPS	n	Unwtd %	Wtd %	n	Unwtd %	Wtd %	
No HS Diploma	20.8	176	15.6	14.4	153	15.2	13.9	
HS Diploma	35.5	348	30.9	32.1	309	30.7	32.1	
Some College	24.3	302	26.8	27.0	268	26.7	26.7	
College Graduate	19.5	300	26.6	26.5	275	27.4	27.4	
Total		1126			1005			

Table 5a: (cont.):
Distribution of the 1992 NES Cross-section sample by current age and education

AGE (Current)	HIGHEST EDUCATION	1992 CPS	n	1994 post			1996 pre			1996 post		
				Unwtd %	Wghtd %	n	Unwtd %	Wghtd %	n	Unwtd %	Wghtd %	n
				(Sel, NR)			(Sel, NR)			(Sel, NR)		
18-21	No College	4.3	13	1.7	2.5	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	
	College	3.1	4	0.5	0.7	1	0.2	0.3	1	0.2	0.3	
	TOTAL	7.3	17	2.2	3.2	1	6.2	0.3	1	0.2	0.3	
22-29	No HS Diploma	2.4	9	1.2	1.1	4	0.7	0.8	3	0.6	0.7	
	HS Diploma	6.1	27	3.6	4.2	20	3.4	4.1	15	2.8	3.2	
	Some College	4.8	46	6.1	6.1	21	3.5	3.8	18	3.3	3.6	
	College Graduate	3.5	16	2.1	2.1	22	3.7	4.0	20	3.7	4.0	
TOTAL		16.7	98	12.9	13.5	67	11.2	12.7	56	10.3	11.5	
30-39	No HS Diploma	3.0	16	2.1	1.7	10	1.7	1.6	10	1.8	1.7	
	HS Diploma	8.7	54	7.1	7.2	40	6.7	6.3	37	6.8	6.5	
	Some College	6.1	77	10.1	9.7	54	9.0	8.7	47	8.6	8.2	
	College Graduate	5.7	74	9.8	9.6	54	9.0	9.3	50	9.2	9.4	
TOTAL		23.4	221	29.1	28.2	158	26.5	25.9	144	26.4	25.8	
40-49	No HS Diploma	2.4	11	1.4	1.3	6	1.0	0.7	5	0.9	0.6	

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

	HS Dip- loma	6.1	39	5.1	5.7	40	6.7	7.3	35	6.4	7.1
	Some College	4.7	26	3.4	3.5	20	3.4	3.8	20	3.7	4.2
	College Graduate	5.0	63	8.3	8.1	59	9.9	9.4	53	9.7	9.3
TOTAL		18.1	139	18.3	18.6	125	20.9	21.2	113	20.7	21.2
50-59	No HS Diploma	2.8	13	1.7	1.8	10	1.7	1.9	10	1.8	2.1
	HS Dip- loma	4.7	35	4.6	5.1	29	4.9	5.3	24	4.4	4.6
	Some College	2.4	23	3.0	3.2	22	3.7	4.0	22	4.0	4.3
	College Graduate	2.5	32	4.2	4.7	28	4.7	4.8	27	5.0	5.1
TOTAL		12.3	103	13.6	14.8	89	14.9	15.9	83	15.2	16.1
60-69	No HS Diploma	3.5	21	2.8	2.8	13	2.2	2.1	12	2.2	2.2
	HS Dip- loma	4.2	28	3.7	3.6	22	3.7	3.6	22	4.0	3.9
	Some College	1.8	10	1.3	1.2	10	1.7	1.6	10	1.8	1.8
	College Graduate	1.7	15	2.0	1.8	18	3.0	2.9	17	3.1	3.1
TOTAL		11.1	74	9.7	9.3	63	10.6	10.2	61	11.2	10.9
70+	No HS Diploma	4.8	35	4.6	3.5	32	5.4	4.2	30	5.5	4.3
	HS Dip- loma	3.6	30	4.0	3.4	25	4.2	3.6	23	4.2	3.7
	Some College	1.5	23	3.0	2.9	21	3.5	3.2	19	3.5	3.2
	College Graduate	1.2	19	2.5	2.6	16	2.7	2.8	15	2.8	2.8
TOTAL		11.1	107	14.1	12.4	94	15.7	13.8	87	16.0	14.1
			759			597			545		

Summary by Education level: 1994 post 1996 pre 1996 post

92 CPS	n	unwtd %	wtd %	n	unwtd %	wtd %	n	unwtd %	wtd %	
No HS Diploma	20.8	108	14.2	12.7	75	12.6	11.2	70	12.8	11.6
HS Diploma	35.5	223	29.4	31.1	176	29.5	30.1	156	28.6	29.1
Some College	24.3	209	27.5	27.2	149	25.0	25.4	137	25.1	25.6
College Graduate										

19.5	219	28.8	29.0	197	33.0	33.2	182	33.4	33.7
Total	759			597			545		

Table 5b:

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

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

60-69	No HS										
	Diploma	3.0	42	4.1	3.7	25	3.5	3.3	23	3.5	3.4
	HS Diploma	3.8	62	6.0	5.5	39	5.4	5.2	35	5.4	5.0
	Some										
	College	1.9	21	2.0	1.9	21	2.9	3.1	21	3.2	3.4
	College										
	Graduate	1.7	19	1.8	2.0	14	2.0	1.9	14	2.2	2.1
TOTAL		10.3	144	13.9	13.2	99	13.8	13.4	93	14.3	13.9
70+	No HS										
	Diploma	4.6	51	4.9	4.1	37	5.1	4.4	36	5.5	4.9
	HS Diploma	3.7	42	4.1	3.6	33	4.6	4.1	32	4.9	4.4
	Some										
	College	1.7	22	2.1	1.8	22	3.1	2.4	21	3.2	2.6
	College										
	Graduate	1.3	26	2.5	2.0	22	3.1	2.8	21	3.2	2.9
TOTAL		11.2	141	13.6	11.5	114	15.9	13.7	110	16.9	14.7
			1036			719			652		

Summary by Education level:

		1994 post			1996 pre			1996 post		
94 CPS	n	Unwtd %	Wtd %	n	Unwtd %	Wtd %	n	Unwtd %	Wtd %	
No HS Diploma										
19.5	171	16.5	16.1	110	15.3	15.2	96	14.7	14.4	
HS Diploma										
33.9	362	34.9	35.6	236	32.8	33.1	209	32.1	31.8	
Some College										
26.4	268	25.9	25.8	192	26.7	26.3	176	27.0	26.8	
College Graduate										
20.3	235	22.7	22.6	181	25.2	25.4	171	26.2	27.0	
Total	1036			719			652			

Table 5c: Distribution of the 1996 NES Cross-section sample by current age and education

		1996 pre		1996 post	
AGE (Current)	HIGHEST EDUCATION	1996 CPS	n	Unwtd %	Wghtd % (Sel, NR)
18-21	No College	4.4	12	3.0	4.1
	College	2.9	23	5.8	7.5
TOTAL		7.3	35	8.8	11.6

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

22-29	No HS							
	Diploma	2.0	4	1.0	0.8	2	0.6	0.5
	HS Dip-							
	loma	4.9	18	4.5	3.9	13	3.9	3.3
	Some							
	College	5.0	13	3.3	2.9	10	3.0	2.9
	College							
	Graduate	3.7	17	4.3	4.0	16	4.8	4.4
TOTAL		15.6	52	13.1	11.5	41	12.2	11.0
30-39	No HS							
	Diploma	2.9	4	1.0	0.8	4	1.2	0.9
	HS Dip-							
	loma	7.6	36	9.0	9.0	29	8.6	8.7
	Some							
	College	6.3	31	7.8	7.6	29	8.6	8.4
	College							
	Graduate	5.9	28	7.0	6.6	23	6.8	6.3
TOTAL		22.8	99	24.9	24.1	85	25.2	24.4
40-49	No HS							
	Diploma	2.4	5	1.3	1.0	4	1.2	0.9
	HS Dip-							
	loma	6.6	23	5.8	6.2	18	5.3	5.6
	Some							
	College	5.5	25	6.3	6.8	20	5.9	6.3
	College							
	Graduate	5.7	22	5.5	5.5	19	5.6	5.7
TOTAL		20.1	75	18.8	19.6	61	18.1	18.5
50-59	No HS							
	Diploma	2.3	7	1.8	1.7	6	1.8	1.7
	HS Dip-							
	loma	4.6	17	4.3	4.9	15	4.4	4.9
	Some							
	College	2.9	17	4.3	3.6	15	4.4	3.8
	College							
	Graduate	3.0	15	3.8	4.8	15	4.4	5.7
TOTAL		12.8	56	14.1	15.2	51	15.1	16.1
60-69	No HS							
	Diploma	2.8	9	2.3	1.9	9	2.7	2.3
	HS Dip-							
	loma	3.7	12	3.0	2.3	11	3.3	2.6
	Some							
	College	1.9	9	2.3	2.5	7	2.1	2.2
	College							
	Graduate	1.8	7	1.8	2.2	6	1.8	2.3
TOTAL		10.1	37	9.3	8.9	33	9.8	9.3
70+	No HS							
	Diploma	4.3	13	3.3	2.8	10	3.0	2.5
	HS Dip-							

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

loma	3.7	22	5.5	4.6	18	5.3	4.5
Some							
College	1.9	6	1.5	1.3	5	1.5	1.4
College							
Graduate	1.5	3	0.8	0.5	3	0.9	0.6
TOTAL	11.3	44	11.1	9.2	36	10.7	8.9
		398			337		

Summary by Education level:

	1996 pre				1996 post			
	96 CPS	n	Unwtd%	Wtd%	n	Unwtd%	Wtd%	
No HS Diploma	18.9	45	11.3	10.3	37	11.0	9.8	
HS Diploma	33.2	137	34.4	33.8	111	32.9	32.1	
Some College	26.4	124	31.2	32.3	107	31.8	33.1	
College								
Graduate	21.5	92	23.1	23.6	82	24.3	25.0	
Total		398			337			

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

AGE	HIGHEST	1992	Unwtd	Wghtd	Post-strat	Unwtd	Wghtd	Post-strat
-----	---------	------	-------	-------	------------	-------	-------	------------

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

(Current)	EDUCATION	CPS	n	%	%	factor	n	%	%	factor
				(Sel,NR)	(92 cps)			(Sel,NR)	(92 cps)	
18-21	No College	4.3	37	3.3	4.6	0.918	34	3.4	4.7	0.900
	College	3.1	25	2.2	2.3	1.313	24	2.4	2.6	1.200
TOTAL		7.3	62	5.5	7.0		58	5.8	7.3	
22-29	No HS									
	Diploma	2.4	15	1.3	1.6	1.506	15	1.5	1.8	1.343
	HS Dip-									
	loma	6.1	53	4.7	4.5	1.354	47	4.7	4.6	1.319
	Some									
	College	4.8	63	5.6	5.6	0.857	56	5.6	5.6	0.864
	College									
	Graduate	3.5	42	3.7	3.7	0.935	38	3.8	3.8	0.908
TOTAL		16.7	173	15.4	15.4		156	15.5	15.8	
30-39	No HS									
	Diploma	3.0	23	2.0	1.6	1.833	22	2.2	1.7	1.747
	HS Dip-									
	loma	8.7	89	7.9	8.0	1.083	78	7.8	7.8	1.109
	Some									
	College	6.1	93	8.3	8.0	0.763	86	8.6	8.3	0.733
	College									
	Graduate	5.7	107	9.5	9.2	0.615	103	10.2	10.0	0.567
TOTAL		23.4	312	27.7	26.8		289	28.8	27.8	
40-49	No HS									
	Diploma	2.4	13	1.2	1.2	2.009	13	1.3	1.3	1.794
	HS Dip-									
	loma	6.1	52	4.6	5.1	1.204	48	4.8	5.2	1.180
	Some									
	College	4.7	48	4.3	4.7	1.013	40	4.0	4.2	1.113
	College									
	Graduate	5.0	70	6.2	6.3	0.791	62	6.2	6.2	0.797
TOTAL		18.1	183	16.3	17.2		163	16.2	16.9	
50-59	No HS									
	Diploma	2.8	27	2.4	2.5	1.118	24	2.4	2.4	1.155
	HS Dip-									
	loma	4.7	43	3.8	4.6	1.020	40	4.0	4.8	0.973
	Some									
	College	2.4	28	2.5	2.4	0.959	25	2.5	2.5	0.955
	College									
	Graduate	2.5	45	4.0	4.2	0.594	39	3.9	4.1	0.609
TOTAL		12.3	143	12.7	13.7		128	12.7	13.7	
60-69	No HS									
	Diploma	3.5	37	3.3	3.0	1.182	30	3.0	2.7	1.282
	HS Dip-									
	loma	4.2	50	4.4	4.0	1.055	39	3.9	3.5	1.199
	Some									
	College	1.8	19	1.7	1.8	1.000	14	1.4	1.4	1.250
	College									

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

Graduate	1.7	16	1.4	1.5	1.114	16	1.6	1.7	0.994
TOTAL	11.1	122	10.8	10.2		99	9.9	9.3	
70+ No HS Diploma	4.8	54	4.8	3.8	1.268	42	4.2	3.1	1.540
HS Diploma	3.6	31	2.8	2.2	1.633	30	3.0	2.4	1.490
Some College	1.5	27	2.4	2.3	0.642	24	2.4	2.2	0.671
College Graduate	1.2	19	1.7	1.5	0.791	16	1.6	1.5	0.818
TOTAL	11.1	131	11.6	9.8		112	11.1	9.2	
		1126				1005			

Summary by Education Level:

	1992 pre				1992 post		
	92 CPS	n	Unwtd%	Wtd%	n	Unwtd%	Wtd%
No HS Diploma	20.8	176	15.6	14.4	153	15.2	13.9
HS Diploma	35.5	348	30.9	32.1	309	30.8	32.1
Some College	24.3	302	26.8	27.0	268	26.7	26.7
College Graduate	19.5	300	26.6	26.5	275	27.4	27.4
Total		1126			1005		

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

1994 post

AGE	HIGHEST EDUCATION	1994 CPS	n	Unwtd %	Wghtd %	Post-strat factor
(Current)					(Sel,NR)	(94 cps)
18-21	No College	4.2	50	2.8	3.5	1.206
	College	3.1	22	1.2	1.7	1.838
TOTAL		7.3	72	4.0	5.2	
22-29	No HS Diploma	2.3	23	1.3	1.2	1.924
	HS Diploma	5.5	72	4.0	4.4	1.252
	Some College	5.3	104	5.8	5.9	0.898
	College Graduate	3.4	51	2.8	2.8	1.230
TOTAL		16.5	250	13.9	14.2	
30-39	No HS Diploma	2.9	37	2.1	2.0	1.503

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

HS Diploma	8.1	147	8.2	8.2	0.979
Some					
College	6.6	150	8.4	8.1	0.822
College					
Graduate	5.7	133	7.4	7.4	0.776
TOTAL	23.3	467	26.0	25.6	
40-49 No HS					
Diploma	2.3	25	1.4	1.5	1.575
HS Diploma	6.1	92	5.1	5.9	1.041
Some					
College	5.2	78	4.4	4.4	1.189
College					
Graduate	5.4	130	7.2	7.2	0.750
TOTAL	19.0	325	18.1	18.9	
50-59 No HS					
Diploma	2.4	29	1.6	1.7	1.407
HS Diploma	4.6	78	4.4	4.7	0.983
Some					
College	2.8	47	2.6	2.6	1.069
College					
Graduate	2.8	61	3.4	3.7	0.736
TOTAL	12.5	215	12.0	12.7	
60-69 No HS					
Diploma	3.0	63	3.5	3.3	0.895
HS Diploma	3.8	90	5.0	4.7	0.805
Some					
College	1.9	31	1.7	1.6	1.175
College					
Graduate	1.7	34	1.9	1.9	0.869
TOTAL	10.3	218	12.1	11.6	
70+ No HS					
Diploma	4.6	86	4.8	3.8	1.188
HS Diploma	3.7	72	4.0	3.5	1.046
Some					
College	1.7	45	2.5	2.2	0.744
College					
Graduate	1.3	45	2.5	2.3	0.559
TOTAL	11.2	248	13.8	11.9	

1795

Summary by Education level: 1994 post

	94 CPS	n	Unwtd%	Wtd%
No HS Diploma	19.5	279	15.5	14.7
HS Diploma	33.9	585	32.6	33.7
Some College	26.4	477	26.6	26.4
College				

Graduate 20.3 454 25.3 25.3
 Total 1795

Table 6c: Distributions and post-stratification factors for the combined 1996 samples

		1996 pre	1996 post							
AGE	HIGHEST EDUCATION	1996 CPS	Unwtd n	Wghtd %	Post-strat %	Post-strat factor	Unwtd n	Wghtd %	Post-strat %	Post-strat factor
18-21	No College	4.4	24	1.4	1.8	2.383	17	1.1	1.5	3.007
	College	2.9	30	1.8	2.6	1.140	27	1.8	2.6	1.118
TOTAL		7.3	54	3.2	4.4		44	2.9	4.1	
22-29	No HS Diploma	2.0	14	0.8	0.9	2.349	8	0.5	0.6	3.673
	HS Diploma	4.9	61	3.6	3.9	1.245	45	2.9	3.1	1.554
	Some College	5.0	65	3.8	3.6	1.388	55	3.6	3.5	1.424
	College Graduate	3.7	61	3.6	3.6	1.025	56	3.6	3.8	0.981
	TOTAL	15.6	201	11.7	12.0		164	10.7	11.0	
30-39	No HS Diploma	2.9	27	1.6	1.5	2.000	24	1.6	1.5	2.028
	HS Diploma	7.6	133	7.8	7.5	1.013	117	7.6	7.3	1.041
	Some College	6.3	138	8.1	7.9	0.805	123	8.0	7.9	0.804
	College Graduate	5.9	123	7.2	7.2	0.811	111	7.2	7.4	0.799
	TOTAL	22.8	421	24.6	24.1		375	24.4	24.0	
40-49	No HS Diploma	2.4	22	1.3	1.3	1.865	18	1.2	1.1	2.080
	HS Diploma	6.6	106	6.2	6.7	0.979	94	6.1	6.6	0.992
	Some College	5.5	88	5.1	5.6	0.979	79	5.1	5.6	0.982
	College Graduate	5.7	138	8.0	7.8	0.726	125	8.2	8.0	0.706
	TOTAL	20.1	354	20.7	21.4		316	20.6	21.4	
50-59	No HS Diploma	2.3	29	1.7	1.8	1.331	28	1.8	1.9	1.233
	HS Diploma	4.6	82	4.8	5.2	0.880	68	4.4	4.8	0.958
	Some College	2.9	55	3.2	3.1	0.914	53	3.5	3.4	0.847
	College Graduate	3.0	68	4.0	4.4	0.672	67	4.4	4.9	0.606
	TOTAL	12.8	234	13.7	14.5		216	14.1	15.0	

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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			
	96 CPS	n	Unwtd%	Wtd%	n	Unwtd%	Wtd%	
No HS Diploma	18.9	230	13.4	12.5	203	13.2	12.2	
HS Diploma	33.2	549	32.0	32.3	476	31.0	31.0	
Some College	26.4	465	27.1	27.6	420	27.4	28.0	
College Graduate	21.5	470	27.4	27.5	435	28.4	28.8	
Total		1714			1534			

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

	1992 pre		1992 post		1994 post	
	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After
1126	1126	1005	1005	1795	1795	
mean	2.4136	2.4038	2.4092	2.4015	2.4201	2.4129
std dev	1.1252	1.0841	1.1075	1.0773	1.1817	1.1494
max	9.6008	5.5521	8.5612	5.2942	8.8935	6.5143
99th	5.5521	5.5521	5.2942	5.2942	6.6514	6.5143
1st	0.7796	0.7796	0.7471	0.7471	0.7999	0.7999
min	0.6480	0.7796	0.6644	0.7471	0.6370	0.7999

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

	1996 pre		1996 post	
	Before	After	Before	After
n	1714	1714	1 534	1534
mean	2.5241	2.5018	2.5112	2.4727
std dev	1.3853	1.2720	1.5714	1.3387
max	13.277	7.5774	16.753	8.4760
99th	7.5774	7.5774	8.4760	8.4760
1st	0.8930	0.8930	0.8496	0.8496
min	0.7104	0.8930	0.6406	0.8496

11. 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.

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

TOTAL		23.4	23.49	23.48	23.3	23.38	22.8	22.94	23.11
40-49	No HS								
	Diploma	2.4	2.19	2.23	2.3	2.27	2.4	2.37	2.39
	HS Diploma	6.1	6.11	6.11	6.1	6.13	6.6	6.61	6.65
	Some								
	College	4.7	4.75	4.74	5.2	5.18	5.5	5.56	5.59
	College								
	Graduate	5.0	4.97	4.97	5.4	5.45	5.7	5.73	5.76
TOTAL		18.1	18.02	18.05	19.0	19.03	20.1	20.27	20.39
50-59	No HS								
	Diploma	2.8	2.76	2.75	2.4	2.36	2.3	2.36	2.37
	HS Diploma	4.7	4.68	4.68	4.6	4.61	4.6	4.64	4.67
	Some								
	College	2.4	2.36	2.36	2.8	2.78	2.9	2.89	2.92
	College								
	Graduate	2.5	2.51	2.51	2.8	2.77	3.0	3.01	3.03
TOTAL		12.3	12.31	12.30	12.5	12.51	12.8	12.90	12.99
60-69	No HS								
	Diploma	3.5	3.52	3.50	3.0	2.99	2.8	2.78	2.79
	HS Diploma	4.2	4.24	4.24	3.8	3.81	3.7	3.72	3.75
	Some								
	College	1.8	1.76	1.75	1.9	1.89	1.9	1.91	1.92
	College								
	Graduate	1.7	1.67	1.67	1.7	1.66	1.8	1.80	1.81
TOTAL		11.1	11.19	11.17	10.3	10.35	10.1	10.21	10.27
70+	No HS								
	Diploma	4.8	4.84	4.83	4.6	4.57	4.3	4.28	4.32
	HS Diploma	3.6	3.52	3.53	3.7	3.68	3.7	3.75	3.78
	Some								
	College	1.5	1.48	1.48	1.7	1.67	1.9	1.88	1.90
	College								
	Graduate	1.2	1.22	1.22	1.3	1.30	1.5	1.52	1.53
TOTAL		11.1	11.06	11.06	11.2	11.22	11.3	11.44	11.53

Summary by Education level:

	'92CPS	'92pre NES	'92post NES	'94CPS	'94post NES	'96CPS	'96pre NES	'96post NES
No HS Diploma	20.8	19.19	19.32	19.5	18.83	18.9	18.25	17.63
HS Diploma	35.5	36.88	36.77	33.9	34.53	33.2	33.37	33.69
Some College	24.3	24.26	24.24	26.4	26.31	26.4	26.69	26.85
College								
Graduate	19.5	19.68	19.68	20.3	20.33	21.5	21.70	21.84

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
significantly lower estimates of voting.

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

1992			1996		
unwghtd	base weight	final weight	unwghtd	base weight	final weight
0.77	0.78	0.75	0.77	0.77	0.72

□>> 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.

REGION	Self-representing MSAs
Northeast	New York, NY-NJ Philadelphia, PA-NJ Boston, MA* Nassau-Suffolk, NY Pittsburgh, PA*
North Central	Chicago, IL Detroit, MI St. Louis, MO* Minneapolis, MN-WI
South	Washington, DC-MD-VA Dallas-Ft Worth, TX Houston, TX* Baltimore, MD* Atlanta, GA
West	Los Angeles, CA San Francisco, CA
REGION	Nonself-representing MSAs
Northeast	Buffalo, NY Newark, NJ Haven, CT Atlantic City, NJ

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
Manchester, NH

North	Milwaukee, WI
Central	Dayton, OH
	Kansas City, MO-KS
	Des Moines, IA
	Grand Rapids, MI
	Fort Wayne, IN
	Steubenville, OH
	Saginaw, MI
South	Birmingham, AL
	Columbus, GA-AL
	Miami, FL
	Jacksonville, FL
	Lakeland, FL
	McAllen, TX
	Waco, TX
	Wheeling, WV
	Knoxville, TN
	Richmond, VA
West	Seattle, WA
	Denver, CO
	Anaheim, CA
	Riverside, CA
	Fresno, CA
	Eugene, OR
	Phoenix, AZ
REGION	Non-MSAs
Northeast	Schuyler, NY
	Gardner, MA
North	Sanilac, MI
Central	Decatur, IN
	Phillips, KS/Saline, NE
	Mower, MN
South	Bulloch, GA
	Sabine, LA
	Hale, TX
	Monroe, AR/Ashley, AR
	Bedford, TN
	Montgomery, VA
	Robeson, NC
West	ElDorado-Alpine, CA
	Carbon, WY

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.

Second Stage Selection of Area Segments

The second stage of the 1980 National Sample was selected directly from computerized files that were prepared from the 1980[8] 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 nonsself-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

1980 N. Samp PSU#	1980 National Sample PSU Name	# of 1992 NES Cross-section Sample Segs.	# of 1992 NES Panel Sample Segments
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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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/ Saline, NE	** 2	6 **
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/ Ashley, AR	** 2	6 **
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 $f=.00003988$ or .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.

SAMPLE DESIGN SPECIFICATIONS

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

	Cross-Section Component (Supplemental)
	Original Specifications and Assumptions
Completed Post/ interview	1,000
Contact/Response Rate	.95
Completed Pre/ interview	1,052
Response Rate	.72
Eligible sample households	1,462
Occupancy/Eligibility Rate[11]	.83
Panel Recontact Rate	
Sample HU listings	
Replicates 1 and 2	1,760
Replicate 1 (incl above) [12]	961
Replicate 2 (incl above) [13]	799
Replicate 3 (Reserve) [14]	200

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
 Replicate 4 (Reserve) 75
 Replicate 5 (Reserve) 51
 Total Sample lines 2,086

	Panel Component	Total
	Original Specifications and Assumptions	
Completed Post/ interview	1,057	2,057
Contact/Response Rate	.95	
Completed Pre/ interview	1,112	2,164
Response Rate[15]	.75	
Eligible sample households	1,483	2,945
Occupancy/Eligibility Rate[11]		
Panel Recontact Rate	.913	
Sample HU listings		
Replicates 1 and 2	1,625	3,385
Replicate 1 (incl above) [12]	900	
Replicate 2 (incl above) [13]	725	
Replicate 3 (Reserve) [14]	208	
Replicate 4 (Reserve)	104	
Replicate 5 (Reserve)	52	
Total Sample lines	1,989[16]	

SAMPLE DESIGN OUTCOMES

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 Assumptions and Actual Sample Design Outcomes for the Cross-Section Component of the 1992 National Pre/Post-Election Survey

	Original Specifications & Assumptions (Reps. 1 & 2)	Original S & A Applied to Actual Release (Reps. 1,2,4 & 5)
Completed Post/Interviews	1,000	1,103
Contact/Response Rate	.95	.95
Released for Recontact	1,052	1,161
Completed Pre/ Interviews	1,052	1,161
Response Rate	.72	.72
Eligible Sample Households	1,462	1,613
Occupancy/Eligibility Rate[17]	.83	.83
Subsampling for dangerous/locked areas	--	--
Sample HU listings	1,760	1,943

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

	Original Specifications & Assumptions (Reps. 1 & 2)	Original S & A Applied to Actual Release (Reps. 1,2,4 & 5)
Completed Post/ Interviews	2,057	2,261
Released for Recontact	2,164	2,380
Completed Pre/ Interviews	2,164	2,380
Eligible Sample Households	2,945	3,239
Total Sample HU listings	3,385[21]	3,724
Growth from update of Cross-Section component		1.015
Selected Sample lines		3,667
	Actual Outcome	
Completed Post/ Interviews	2,255	
Released for Recontact	2,487	
Completed Pre/ Interviews	2,487	
Eligible Sample Households	3,274	
Total Sample HU listings	3,712	

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
projected outcome for the sample lines released.

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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,

proportions) and their differences. REPERR is an OSIRIS program which incorporates algorithms for replicated approaches to variance estimation. Both Balanced Repeated Replication (BRR) and Jackknife Repeated Replication (JRR) are available as program options. The current version of REPERR is best suited for estimating sampling errors and design effects for regression and correlation statistics.

Sampling Error Codes and Calculation Model

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 (SECUs) 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 SECUs 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)

Pair (Stratum)	(SECU) 1 of 2 Codes	(SECU) 2 of 2 Codes
1	103	104
2	105	106
3	99	100
4	101	102
5	95	96
6	97	98
7	93	94
8	91	92
9	89	90
10	83	84
11	81	82
12	77	78
13	75	76
14	73	74
15	2	6
16	7	8
17	14	16
18	17	18

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

19	19	21
20	24	28
21	11	29
22	30	33
23	37	43
24	40	48
25	42	45
26	50	51
27	52	36 + 55
28	57	64
29	60	61 + 63
30	67	68

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 2/3rds National Sample design used in 1992.

Table 16: 1992 Pre/Post-Election Survey: Cross-Section Analysis[23] Paired Selection Model for Sampling Error Computations (1992 Sampling Error Coded - Variable #3068)

Pair (SE Stratum)	(SECU) 1 of 2	(SECU) 2 of 2
1	1	2
2	1	2
3	1	2
4	1	2
5	1	2
6	1	2
7	1	2
8	1	2
9	1	2
10	1	2
11	1	2
12	1	2
13	1	2
14	1	2
15	1	2
16	1	2
17	1	2
18	1	2
19	1	2
20	1	2
21	1	2
22	1	2
23	1	2
24	1	2
25	1	2
26	1	2
27	1	2
28	1	2
29	1	2
30	1	2
31	1	2
32	1	2
33	1	2
34	1	2
35	1	2

```

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
  36      1      2
  37      1      2
  38      1      2
  39      1      2
  40      1      2
  41      1      2
  42      1      2

```

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.

APPROXIMATE STANDARD ERRORS FOR PERCENTAGES

For percentage estimates near.

Sample n	50%	40% or 60%	30% or 70%	20% or 80%	10% or 90%
----------	-----	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------

The approximate standard error of the percentage is:

100	5.385	5.277	4.933	4.308	3.231
200	3.912	3.824	3.581	3.128	2.343
300	3.278	3.210	3.006	2.260	1.962
400	2.905	2.846	2.661	2.324	1.743
500	2.663	2.603	2.437	2.128	1.593

	anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt				
750	2.294	2.244	2.094	1.657	1.250
1000	2.078	2.039	1.907	1.657	1.250
1500	1.846	1.803	1.688	1.474	1.102
2000	1.722	1.691	1.568	1.368	1.030
2500	1.637	1.604	1.506	1.310	0.982

□>> 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 subselection 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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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 [1] 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 *)

REGION	Self-representing MSAs
Northeast	New York, NY-NJ Philadelphia, PA-NJ Boston, MA Nassau-Suffolk, NY* Pittsburgh, PA
North	Chicago, IL
Central	Detroit, MI St. Louis, MO Minneapolis, MN-WI*
South	Washington, DC-MD-VA* Dallas-Ft Worth, TX* Houston, TX Baltimore, MD Atlanta, GA*
West	Los Angeles, CA San Francisco, CA
REGION	NonselF-representing MSAs
Northeast	Buffalo, NY Newark, NJ* New Haven, CT Atlantic City, NJ Manchester, NH
North	Milwaukee, WI
Central	Dayton, OH

```

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
      Kansas City, MO-KS*
      Des Moines, IA
      Grand Rapids, MI
      Fort Wayne, IN
      Steubenville, OH
      Saginaw, MI*
South   Birmingham, AL
      Columbus, GA-AL
      Miami, FL
      Jacksonville, FL*
      Lakeland, FL
      McAllen, TX
      Waco, TX*
      Wheeling, WV
      Knoxville, TN
      Richmond, VA
West    Seattle, WA
      Denver, CO
      Anaheim, CA
      Riverside, CA*
      Fresno, CA
      Eugene, OR
      Phoenix, AZ*

REGION   Non-MSAs
Northeast Schuyler, NY
      Gardner, MA*
North    Sanilac, MI
Central  Decatur, IN*
      Saline, NE
      Mower, MN
South    Bulloch, GA
      Sabine, LA*
      Hale, TX
      Ashley, AR
      Bedford, TN
      Montgomery, VA*
      Robeson, NC
West     Eldorado-Alpine, CA
      Carbon, WY

```

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

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

Nonselself-representing MSAs: North Central

526	A	Milwaukee, WI	6		2
527	A	Dayton, OH	6		2
528	B1	Kansas City, MO-KS	6		6
529	A	Des Moines, IA	6		2
531	A	Grand Rapids, MI	6		2
532	A	Fort Wayne, IN	6		2
533	A	Steubenville, OH-WV	6		2
534	B1	Saginaw, MI	6		6

Nonselself-representing MSAs: South

536	A	Birmingham, AL	6		2
539	A	Columbus, GA-AL	6		2
540	A	Miami, FL	6	(1)	2
542	B1	Jacksonville, FL	6		6
543	A	Lakeland, FL	6		2
544	A	McAllen, TX	6		2
545	B1	Waco, TX	6	(5)	6
547	A	Wheeling, WV-OH	6		2
549	A	Knoxville, TN	6		2
550	A	Richmond, VA	6		2

Nonselself-representing MSAs: West

553	A	Seattle, WA	6		2
555	A	Denver, CO	6		2
556	A	Anaheim, CA	6		2
557	B1	Riverside-San Bernardino, CA	6		6
558	A	Fresno, CA	6		2
559	A	Eugene, OR	6		2
560	B1	Phoenix, AZ	6		6

Nonselself-representing Non-MSAs: Northeast

463	A	Schuyler, NY	6		2
464	B1	Gardner, MA	6		6

Nonselself-representing Non-MSAs: North Central

465	A	Sanilac, MI	6		2
466	B1	Decatur, IN	6		6
468	A	Saline, NE	6		2
470	A	Mower, MN	6		2

Nonselself-representing Non-MSAs: South

473	A	Bulloch, GA	6		2
474	B1	Sabine, LA	6		5
476	A	Hale, TX	6		2
477	A	Ashley, AR	6		2
478	A	Bedford, TN	6		2
480	B1	Montgomery, VA	6		5
481	A	Robeson, NC	6		2

Nonselself-representing Non-MSAs: West

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

482	A	ElDorado-Alpine, CA	6	(1)	2
484	A	Carbon, WY	6		2
Total Number of Segments			(363) 366	(191)	206

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 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 $f=.00001885$ 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),

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

.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

	Cross-Section Component	Panel Component	Total
Completed Post interviews	1,130	620	1,750
Response Rate	.74	.691	
Eligible sample households	1,527	897	2,945
Occupancy/Eligibility Rate[9]	.83	NA	
Panel Recontact Rate	NA	.915	
Sample Units	1,840	980	3,385
Change from Update	1.02	.975	
Total Sample lines	1,804	1,005	2,809

[9] Based on field experience in 1986 NES study.

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

	Base Sample Rep 1	Reserve Sample Replicates Rep 2	Rep 3	Rep 4	Total
Completed Interviews	1,097	31	31	31	1,190
Response Rate	.74	.74	.74	.74	.74
Designated Respondents	1,482	42	42	42	1,608
Occupancy/Elig Rate[10]	.83	.83	.83	.83	.83
Sample Units	1,783	51	51	51	1,939
Change from Update	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02
Total Sample lines	1,751	50	50	50	1,901

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

	Original Specifications & Assumptions Applied to:	Actual Outcome
	Actual Release (Replicate 1)	
Completed Interviews	1,097	1,036
Response Rate	.74	.721
Designated Respondents	1,482	1,436
Occupancy/Eligibility Rate	.83	.824
		1,740
Subsampling for dangerous/locked areas	--	.99[11]
Sample HU listings	1,786	1,757
Sample growth from update[12]	1.02	1.00
Selected Sample lines	1,751	1,751

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

	Original Specifications	Actual Outcome
--	-------------------------	----------------

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
& Assumptions
Applied to Release

Completed Interviews	620[13]	759
Response Rate	.691[14]	.770
HHs with Eligible Resp	897	986
Panel Recontact Rate	.917	.981
Sample Units	980	1,005
Change from update	.975	
Total Panel Cases	1,005	1,005

Table 7: Figures for Original Sample Design Specifications
and Assumptions and Actual Sample Design Outcomes
for the Combined Cross-Section/Panel Sample.
1994 National Post-Election Survey

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

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

PSU Type	Census Region	Response Rate	Nonresponse Adjustment Weight
----------	---------------	---------------	-------------------------------

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

SR-MSA	Middle Atlantic	74.6	1.340
	East North Central	84.0	1.190
	West North Central	92.9	1.077
	South Atlantic	71.8	1.392
	West South Central	75.0	1.333
	Pacific	66.7	1.500
NSR-MSA	New England &		
	Middle Atlantic	70.8	1.413
	East North Central	78.8	1.269
	West North Central	71.4	1.400
	South Atlantic	75.0	1.333
	East South Central &		
	West South Central	77.6	1.289
	Mountain	92.8	1.078
Pacific	72.2	1.386	
NSR-non MSA	New England &		
	Middle Atlantic	58.7	1.704
	East North Central &		
	West North Central	81.0	1.234
	South Atlantic	82.7	1.210
	East South Central &		
	West South Central	81.8	1.222
Mountain & Pacific	66.7	1.50	

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

PSU Type	Census Region	Response Rate	Nonresponse Adjustment Weight
SR-MSA	New England &		
	Middle Atlantic	56.0	1.787
	East North Central &		
	West North Central	65.1	1.536
	South Atlantic	72.0	1.389
	West South Central	52.0	1.923
Pacific	48.4	2.067	
NSR-MSA	New England	44.0	2.273
	Middle Atlantic	65.6	1.524
	East North Central	68.6	1.458
	West North Central	71.1	1.406
	South Atlantic	82.7	1.209
	East South Central	80.4	1.243
	West South Central	82.5	1.212
	Mountain	85.3	1.172
Pacific	71.3	1.402	
NSR-non MSA	New England &		
	Middle Atlantic	72.5	1.379
	East North Central &		
	West North Central	87.8	1.139
	South Atlantic	72.4	1.382
East South Central &			

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
 West South Central 74.7 1.339
 Mountain & Pacific 94.6 1.057

Table 10
 1994 NES Panel Post-Stratification Weight

Sex	Census Region	Age Group	Census Est. July 1, 1993	94 Nat'l Election Study	Post-Strat. Weight	
Male	Northeast	18-44	10,652,000	8,676,130	1.2277	
		45-64	4,867,000	5,246,960	0.9276	
		65+	2,815,000	2,880,610	0.9772	
	Midwest	18-44	12,679,000	13,912,400	0.9113	
		45-64	5,626,000	6,229,820	0.9031	
		65+	3,211,000	5,109,480	0.6284	
	South	18-44	18,797,000	16,207,280	1.1598	
		45-64	8,177,000	9,324,160	0.8770	
		65+	4,574,000	3,440,280	1.3295	
	West	18-44	12,611,000	8,973,210	1.4054	
		45-64	4,908,000	2,573,920	1.9068	
		65+	2,580,000	2,295,480	1.1239	
Female	Northeast	18-44	10,844,000	8,032,420	1.3500	
		45-64	5,338,000	3,233,370	1.6509	
		65+	4,329,000	3,012,940	1.4368	
	Midwest	18-44	12,783,000	11,746,140	1.0883	
		45-64	5,990,000	6,753,230	0.8870	
		65+	4,789,000	4,847,570	0.9879	
	South	18-44	18,950,000	17,179,490	1.1031	
		45-64	8,882,000	9,486,140	0.9363	
		65+	6,753,000	5,970,310	1.1311	
	West	18-44	11,979,000	10,117,500	1.1840	
		45-64	5,077,000	3,416,980	1.4858	
		65+	3,543,000	2,752,280	1.2873	
	Totals			190,754,000	171,418,100	

Table 11
 1994 NES Cross-section Post-Stratification Weight

Sex	Census Region	Age Group	Census Est. July 1, 1993	94 Nat'l Election Study	Post-Strat. Weight
Male	Northeast	18-44	10,652,000	7,780,520	1.3691
		45-64	4,867,000	3,562,080	1.3663
		65+	2,815,000	2,807,870	1.0025
	Midwest	18-44	12,679,000	13,282,300	0.9546
		45-64	5,626,000	6,435,320	0.8742
		65+	3,211,000	3,968,760	0.8091
	South	18-44	18,797,000	16,523,490	1.1376
		45-64	8,177,000	8,230,300	0.9935
		65+	4,574,000	4,023,460	1.1368
West	18-44	12,611,000	9,120,530	1.3827	
	45-64	4,908,000	3,867,010	1.2692	
	65+	2,580,000	2,414,850	1.0684	
Female	Northeast	18-44	10,844,000	8,160,800	1.3288
		45-64	5,338,000	3,776,480	1.4135
		65+	4,329,000	4,027,800	1.0748
	Midwest	18-44	12,783,000	11,222,760	1.1390

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt				
	45-64	5,990,000	6,169,130	0.9710
	65+	4,789,000	4,186,580	1.1439
South	18-44	18,950,000	17,375,850	1.0906
	45-64	8,882,000	7,917,440	1.1218
	65+	6,753,000	5,942,100	1.1365
West	18-44	11,979,000	10,060,750	1.1907
	45-64	5,077,000	4,359,910	1.1645
	65+	3,543,000	3,088,300	1.1472
Totals		190,754,000	168,304,380	

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

Years of Residence	Education Level	Age Group	Panel Attrition Weight Factor	
< 3	< HS Graduate	25-39	1.750	
		40+	1.818	
	< HS Grad, HS Grad	17-24	1.428	
		25-39	1.933	
	HS Graduate	40+	1.562	
		17-24	1.375	
		25-39	1.376	
		40+	1.326	
	3+	< HS Grad	17-39	1.308
			40-64	1.423
65-74			1.583	
75+			2.125	
17-24			1.571	
HS Graduate		25-39	1.533	
		40-64	1.443	
		65-74	1.417	
		75+	1.500	
		17-24	1.417	
> HS Graduate	25-39	1.354		
	40-64	1.564		
	65-74	1.269		
	75+	1.769		
	17-24	1.417		

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.

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

Standard analysis software systems such 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 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. 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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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 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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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 13. 1994 National Election Study
Sampling Error Codes

Sampling Error Stratum Code	SECU Code (Half Sample)	PSU Number	Segment Numbers			Segment Numbers		
			Cross-Section	Panel	Panel	Panel	Panel	
01	1	501	103	119	135	103	103	103
	2	501	107	123	139	123		
02	1	501	111	127	143	111	127	143
	2	501	115	131	148	131	148	
03	1	502	110	123	136	136		
	2	502	101	114	126	114		
04	1	502	104	117	129	117	129	
	2	502	107	120	133	120		
05	1	503	112	129		112	129	
	2	503	117	134		117	134	
06	1	503	103	120		103	120	
	2	503	107	125		107	125	
07	1	504	102	110	117	102	110	117
	2	504	106	113	121	106	113	121
08	1	505	105	112	119	105	112	119
	2	505	101	108	115	101	108	115
09	1	506	104	110	116	104	110	116
	2	506	101	107	113	107	113	
10	1	507	105	111	115	105	111	115

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

	2	507	103	107	113	103	107	113
11	1	508	101	107	110	101	107	110
	2	508	103	109	114	103	109	114
12	1	509	104	109	114			
	2	509	101	107	111			
13	1	510	105	111				
	2	510	101	107				
14	1	511	105	111		105	111	
	2	511	102	108		102	108	
15	1	512	102	108				
	2	512	105	111				
16	1	513	101	107				
	2	513	104	110				
17	1	514	104	110				
	2	514	101	107				
18	1	515	105	111		105	111	
	2	515	102	108		102	108	
19	1	516	102	108		102	108	
	2	516	105	111		105	111	
20	1	517	101	103	105	105	111	
			107	109	111			
	2	518	101	103	105	101	103	105
			107	109	111	107	109	111
21	1	521	103	105	107	103	109	
			109	111				
	2	523	103	105	107	105	111	
			109	111				
22	1	524	102	104	106	102	108	
			108	110	112			
	2	534	102	104	106	102	104	106
			108	110	112	108	110	112
23	1	526	101	103	105	105	111	
			107	109	111			
	2	527	101	103	105	103	109	
			107	109	111			
24	1	528	102	104	106	102	104	106
			108	110	112	108	110	112
	2	529	102	104	106	106	112	
			108	110	112			
25	1	531	102	104	106	106	112	
			108	110	112			
	2	532	102	104	106	104	110	
			108	110	112			
26	1	533	102	104	106	106	112	
			108	110	112			
	2	547	101	103	105	101	107	
			107	109	111			
27	1	536	101	103	105	105	111	
			107	109	111			
	2	539	101	103	105	105	111	
			107	109	111			
28	1	540	101	103	105	109		
			107	109	111			
	2	542	102	104	106	102	104	106
			108	110	112	108	110	112
29	1	543	102	104	106	104	106	
			108	110	112			

```

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
      2          545      103 105 107 101 103 105
      109 111
30      1          544      101 103 105 103 109
      107 109 111
      2          476      001 004 006 001 012
      007 010 012
31      1          549      101 103 105 103 109
      107 109 111
      2          550      103 105 105 103 109
      107 109 111
32      1          553      102 104 106 106 112
      108 110 112
      2          555      101 103 105 105 111
      107 109 111
33      1          556      101 105 107 101 107
      109 111
      2          557      102 104 106 102 104 106
      108 110 112 108 110 112
34      1          558      102 104 106 102 108
      108 110 112
      2          559      101 103 105 105 111
      107 109 111
35      1          560      104 108 112 104 108 112
      2          560      102 106 110 102 106 110
36      1          463      001 003 005 002 008
      007 009 011
      2          464      002 004 005 001 004 005
      009 010 012 009 011 012
37      1          465      001 003 005 005 011
      007 009 011
      2          466      002 004 005 001 004 008
      008 010 012 010 011 012
38      1          468      001 002 006 006 012
      007 008 011
      2          470      002 003 005 002 012
      007 011 012
39      1          473      001 005 008 006 012
      009 011 012 008 011
      2          474      002 004 007 001 004 007
      008 011 012 008 011
40      1          477      001 003 005 006 012
      007 010 012
      2          478      002 005 006 005 010
      008 010 012
41      1          480      002 006 007 002 005 007
      008 010 012 010 011
      2          481      001 004 005 001 008
      007 009 011
42      1          482      002 004 005 007
      007 009 012
      2          484      001 004 006 004 011
      009 011 012

```

Generalized Sampling Error Results for the 1994 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 [16]. For each estimate, sampling errors were computed for the total sample and for twenty demographic and

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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 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:

Sample n	50%	40%	30%	20%	10%
		or 60%	or 70%	or 80%	or 90%

The approximate standard error of the percentage is:

100	5.406	5.297	4.955	4.325	3.244
200	3.853	3.775	3.531	3.082	2.312
300	3.170	3.106	2.905	2.536	1.902
400	2.766	2.710	2.535	2.213	1.660
500	2.492	2.442	2.284	1.994	1.495
750	2.072	2.030	1.899	1.658	1.243
1000	1.826	1.789	1.674	1.461	1.096
1250	1.661	1.628	1.523	1.329	0.997
1500	1.542	1.511	1.413	1.233	0.925
1800	1.434	1.405	1.315	1.147	0.861

References

Binder, D.A. (1983), "On the variances of asymptotically normal estimators from complex surveys," International Statistical Review, Vol. 51, pp. 279-292.

Kalton, G. (1977), "Practical methods for estimating survey sampling errors," Bulletin of the International Statistical Institute, Vol 47, 3, pp. 495-514.

- anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
- Kish, L. (1965), *Survey Sampling*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Kish, L., & Frankel, M.R. (1974), "Inference from complex samples," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, B*, Vol. 36, pp. 1-37.
- Kish, L., & Hess, I. (1959), "On variances of ratios and their differences in multi-stage samples," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 54, pp. 416-446.
- LePage, R., & Billard, L. (1992), *Exploring the Limits of Bootstrap*. New York: John Wiley Sons, Inc.
- Mahalanobis, P.C. (1946), "Recent experiments in statistical sampling at the Indian Statistical Institute," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, Vol 109, pp. 325-378.
- Rao, J.N.K & Wu, C.F.J. (1988.), "Resampling inference with complex sample data," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 83, pp. 231-239.
- Wolter, K.M. (1985). *Introduction to Variance Estimation*. New York: Springer -Verlag.
- Woodruff, R.S. (1971), "A simple method for approximating the variance of a complicated estimate," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, Vol. 66, pp. 411-414.

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.
- [5] Kish, L. (1965). *Survey Sampling*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, NY.
- [6] Kish, L. (1949). "A procedure for objective respondent selection within the household," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, Vol

44, pp. 380-387.

[7] 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.

[8] 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.

[9] 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.

[10] 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.)

[11] 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.

[12] 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.

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

[14] 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.

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

[16] 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.

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

[17] 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



anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

1994 NES
Panel
(n=759)

1994 NES
Cross-section
(n=1,036)

1996 NES
Panel
(n=1,795)

1996 NES
Cross-section
(n=803) [2]

Both 1980 & 1990
National Samples

1996 NES
Combined Sample
(n=2,598)

Selection Stages for the 1996 NES Panel Component: 1980 SRC National Sample[3]

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 subselection 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[4] 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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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[6] 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

National Sample PSU Number and Partition	National Sample PSU Name	# of 1996 NES Panel Segments
--	-----------------------------	---------------------------------

Six Largest Self-representing PSUs

501	A	New York, NY-NJ	11
502	A	Los Angeles, CA	10
503	A	Chicago, IL	8
504	A	Philadelphia, PA-NJ	6
505	A	Detroit, MI	6
506	A	San Francisco, CA	6

Ten Remaining Self-representing PSUs

507	B1	Washington, DC-MD-VA	6
508	B1	Dallas-Ft Worth, TX	6
509	A	Houston, TX	5
510	A	Boston, MA	3
511	B1	Nassau-Suffolk, NY	4
512	A	St Louis, MO-IL	3
513	A	Pittsburgh, PA	4
514	A	Baltimore, MD	4
515	B1	Minneapolis, MN-WI	4
516	B1	Atlanta, GA	4

NonselF-representing MSAs: Northeast

517	A	Buffalo, NY	5
518	B1	Newark, NJ	6
521	A	New Haven, CT	5
523	A	Atlantic City, NJ	5
524	A	Manchester, NH	6

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

526	A	Milwaukee, WI	6
527	A	Dayton, OH	5
528	B1	Kansas City, MO-KS	6
529	A	Des Moines, IA	6
531	A	Grand Rapids, MI	6
532	A	Fort Wayne, IN	6
533	A	Steubenville, OH-WV	6
534	B1	Saginaw, MI	6

NonselF-representing MSAs: South

536	A	Birmingham, AL	6
539	A	Columbus, GA-AL	6
540	A	Miami, FL	6
542	B1	Jacksonville, FL	6
543	A	Lakeland, FL	6
544	A	McAllen, TX	6
545	B1	Waco, TX	6

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

547	A	Wheeling, WV-OH	6
549	A	Knoxville, TN	6
550	A	Richmond, VA	6

Nonsself-representing MSAs: West

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

Nonsself-representing Non-MSAs: Northeast

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

Nonsself-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

Nonsself-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

Nonsself-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 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 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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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

National Sample PSU Number and Partition	National Sample PSU Name	# of 1996 NES Panel Segments
--	-----------------------------	---------------------------------

Eight Largest Self-representing PSUs

120	A	New York, NY MSA	13
190	A	Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA MSA	12
130	A	Chicago, IL MSA	9
121	A	Philadelphia, PA-NJ MSA	7
131	A	Detroit, MI MSA	6
150	A	Washington DC-MD-VA MSA	6
110	A	Boston, MA NECMA	6
171	A	Dallas and Ft Worth, TX CMSA	6

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
154	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
273	B1[13]	Waco, TX MSA	4
274	A	McAllen-Edinburg-Mission, TX MSA	4

Nonself-representing MSAs: West

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

280	A	Salt Lake City-Ogden etc, UT MSA	4
292	A	Fresno, CA MSA	4
293	A	Eugene-Springfield, OR MSA	4

Nonsself-representing Non-MSAs: Northeast

320	A	Elk County, PA	4
-----	---	----------------	---

Nonsself-representing Non-MSAs: Midwest

332	A	Switzerland County, IN	4
342	A	Taney County, MO	4

Nonsself-representing Non-MSAs: South

351	A	Harrisonburg IC, VA	4
354	A	Wheatfield County, GA	4
370	B1	Jim Wells County, TX	4

Nonsself-representing Non-MSAs: West

381	A	Sandoval County, NM	4
-----	---	---------------------	---

Total Number of Segments 210

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

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

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-selfrepresenting MSAs and 7 of the 14 non-MSAs were retained for the 1996 NES Cross-section supplement (or 26 of 40 NSR PSUs).

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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]

Cross-section Component	Panel Component	Total
----------------------------	-----------------	-------

Completed Interviews	430	398	1320	1316	1750	1714
Response Rate	0.72	0.60	0.75	0.76		
Eligible Sample						
Households	597	666	1760	1741	2357	2407
Eligibility Rate	0.95	0.96	NA	NA		
Panel Recontact Rate	NA	NA	0.98	0.98		
Occupied Households	628	692	1795	1781	2423	2473
Occupancy/growth Rate	0.86	0.85	1.00	1.00		
Total Sample Lines	730	817	1795	1788	2525	2605

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]

Mode	# Released	NI	NIP	Refusal	Interviews	Recontact/
------	------------	----	-----	---------	------------	------------

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
Response Rate

Face-to-Face:	875	35	23	42	774	0.89
Include in						
Experiment	742	22	17	34	668	0.90
Exclude from						
Experiment	133	13	6	8	106	0.80
Telephone:	839	25	17	37	760	0.90
Include in						
Experiment	759	21	16	33	689	0.91
Exclude from						
Experiment	80	4	1	4	71	0.89
 Total	 1714	 60	 40	 79	 1534	 0.90

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.

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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

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

Table 7

Computation of Nonresponse Adjustment Weights -- 1996 NES Panel Component

PSU Type	Census Division	Response Rate (%)	Nonresponse Adjustment Weight	
SR-MSA	New England & Middle Atlantic	72.90	1.372	
	East North Central	72.50	1.379	
	West North Central	86.05	1.162	
	South Atlantic	77.91	1.284	
	West South Central	63.64	1.571	
	Central Pacific	65.85	1.519	
	NSR-MSA	New England & Middle Atlantic	71.96	1.390
		East North Central	76.03	1.315
		West North Central	70.77	1.413
South Atlantic		76.71	1.304	
East South Central		64.71	1.545	

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

	Central		
	West South	70.59	1.417
	Central		
	Mountain	76.98	1.299
	Pacific	76.67	1.304
NSR-non MSA	New England &	81.82	1.222
	Middle Atlantic		
	East North	84.62	1.182
	Central		
	West North	72.73	1.375
	Central		
	South Atlantic	84.96	1.177
	East South	76.53	1.307
	Central &		
	West South		
	Central		
	Mountain &	70.73	1.414
	Pacific		

1996 Combined NES Post-stratification Factor

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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 8: 1996 NES Combined (Cross-section and Panel) Sample Post-Stratification Factor

Sex	Census Region	Age Group	Census Est. July 1, 1995	1996 NES Weighted[21]	Post-Stratification Factor
Male	Northeast	18-44	10,440,000	9,885,067	1.056
		45-64	5,019,000	5,329,059	0.942
		65+	2,892,000	3,152,420	0.917
	Midwest	18-44	12,645,000	10,248,770	1.234
		45-64	5,870,000	7,553,155	0.777
		65+	3,310,000	3,215,352	1.029
	South	18-44	18,919,000	15,799,320	1.197
		45-64	8,691,000	8,455,024	1.028
		65+	4,789,000	5,216,866	0.918
	West	18-44	12,778,000	9,478,170	1.348
		45-64	5,298,000	5,349,446	0.990
		65+	2,708,000	2,347,394	1.154
Female	Northeast	18-44	10,630,000	8,990,888	1.182
		45-64	5,503,000	5,895,540	0.933
		65+	4,378,000	3,556,867	1.231
	Midwest	18-44	12,749,000	11,606,790	1.098
		45-64	6,234,000	6,622,310	0.941
		65+	4,871,000	4,952,220	0.984
	South	18-44	19,077,000	20,443,010	0.933
		45-64	9,397,000	9,362,888	1.004
		65+	7,016,000	6,738,762	1.041
	West	18-44	12,169,000	11,691,630	1.041
		45-64	5,454,000	5,937,677	0.919
		65+	3,686,000	3,664,183	1.006
Totals			194,523,000	185,492,800	

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

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

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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 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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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 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

SE Stratum	SEC U	SE Code	PSU	Segment #s Panel (1992,1994)			Total Respondents (In 1996)
01	1	011	501	103	119	135	8
	2	012	501	107	123	139	3
02	1	021	501	111	127	143	13
	2	022	501	115	131	148	8
03	1	031	502	110	123	136	4
	2	032	502	101	114		4
04	1	041	502	117	129		4
	2	042	502	107	120	133	5
05	1	051	503	112	129		7
	2	052	503	117	134		12
06	1	061	503	103	120		8
	2	062	503	107	125		7
07	1	071	504	102	110	117	13
	2	072	504	106	113	121	9

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

08	1	081	505	105	112	119	10
	2	082	505	101	108	115	14
09	1	091	506	104	110	116	8
	2	092	506	101	107	113	2
10	1	101	507	105	111	115	17
	2	102	507	103	107	113	24
11	1	111	508	101	107	110	13
	2	112	508	103	109	114	6
12	1	121	509	104	114		4
	2	122	509	101	107	111	5
13	1	131	510	101	111		2
	2	132	510	107			1

SE Stratum	SEC U	SE Code	PSU	Segment #s Panel (1992,1994)			Total Respondents (In 1996)
14	1	141	511	105	111		6
	2	142	511	102	108		8
15	1	151	512	102			3
	2	152	512	105	111		4
16	1	161	513	101	107		2
	2	162	513	104	110		5
17	1	171	514	104	110		4
	2	172	514	101	107		2
18	1	181	515	105	111		15
	2	182	515	102	108		15
19	1	191	516	102	108		10
	2	192	516	105	111		10
20	1	201	517	103	105		13
	2	202	518	107	109	111	28
21	1	211	521	101	103	105	12
	2	212	523	107	109	111	13
22	1	221	524	103	105	107	11
	2	222	534	102	104	106	18
23	1	231	526	108	110	112	19
	2	232	527	102	104	106	13
24	1	241	528	101	103	105	30
	2	242	529	107	109	111	16
25	1	251	531	102	104	106	29
	2	252	532	108	110	112	18
26	1	261	533	102	104	106	14
	2	262	547	102	104	106	12
27	1	271	536	108	110	112	14
				101	103	105	

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

				107	109	111	
	2	272	539	101	103	105	17
				107	109	111	
28	1	281	540	101	103	105	11
				107	109	111	
	2	282	542	102	104	106	31
				108	110	112	
29	1	291	543	102	104	106	29
				108	110	112	
	2	292	545	103	105	107	42
				109	111		
30	1	301	544	101	103	105	18
				107	109	111	
	2	302	476	001	004	006	9
				007	012		
31	1	311	549	101	103	105	18
				107	109	111	
	2	312	550	101	103	105	24
				107	109	111	
32	1	321	553	102	104	106	15
				108	110	112	
	2	322	555	101	103	105	30
				107	109	111	
33	1	331	556	101	105	107	18
				109	111		
	2	332	557	102	104	106	33
				108	110	112	
34	1	341	558	102	104	106	24
				108	110	112	
	2	342	559	101	103	105	25
				107	109	111	
35	1	351	560	104	108	112	44
	2	352	560	102	106	110	23
36	1	361	463	001	002	003	005
				007	008	009	011
	2	362	464	001	002	004	005
				008	009	010	012
37	1	371	465	001	005		
				007	009	011	
	2	372	466	001	002	004	005
				008	010	011	012
38	1	381	468	001	002	006	
				007	008	011	012
	2	382	470	002	003	005	
				007	011	012	
39	1	391	473	001	005	006	008
				009	011	012	
	2	392	474	001	002	004	007
				008	011		
40	1	401	477	001	003	005	006
				007	010	012	
	2	402	478	002	005	006	
				008	010	012	
41	1	411	480	002	005	006	007
				008	010	011	012
	2	412	481	001	004	005	007
				008	009	011	
42	1	421	482	002	004	005	
				007	009	012	

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

2 422 484 001 004 009 11
011 012

1996 NES Cross-section Segments (from 1990 National Sample Frame):

SE Stratum	SEC U	SE Code	PSU	Segment #s (1996 Cross Section)	Total Rs (1996)
51	1	511	120	003, 019, 035, 051 067, 083, 099	4
	2	512	120	011, 027, 043, 059, 075, 091	4
53	1	531	190	003, 019, 035, 196[23] 051, 067, 083 002, 014	4
	2	532	190	011, 027, 043, 059, 075, 091 196[24] 010, 022	3

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

	2	722	213	004, 008, 016, 020	7
73	1	731	230	002, 010, 014, 022	12
	2	732	236	002, 010, 014, 022	12
76	1	761	239	001, 005, 013, 017	7
	2	762	240	006, 010, 018, 022	9
77	1	771	262	002, 010, 014, 022	19
	2	772	255	008, 012, 020, 024	10
78	1	781	257	004, 012, 016, 024	5
	2	782	258	002, 006, 014, 018	12
79	1	791	273	003, 011, 015, 023	4
	2	792	274	002, 006, 014, 018	5
81	1	811	260	003, 011, 015, 023	9
	2	812	250	007, 011, 019, 023	7
84	1	841	292	001, 009, 013, 021	10
	2	842	293	007, 011, 019, 023	10
85	1	851	280	002, 014	6
	2	852	280	006, 018	4
86	1	861	320	006, 018	5
	2	862	320	010, 022	7
87	1	871	332	004, 008, 016, 020	22
	2	872	342	008, 012, 020, 024	9
88	1	881	351	001, 009, 013, 021	32
	2	882	354	008, 012, 020, 024	13
89	1	891	370	005, 009, 017, 021	12
	2	892	381	001, 005, 013, 017	17

Total:

1714

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:

Sample n	50%	40% or 60%	30% or 70%	20% or 80%	10% or 90%
----------	-----	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------

The approximate standard error of the percentage is:

100	6.730	6.594	6.168	5.384	4.038
200	4.759	4.663	4.362	3.807	2.855
300	3.886	3.807	3.561	3.108	2.331
400	3.365	3.297	3.084	2.692	2.019
500	3.010	2.949	2.758	2.408	1.806
750	2.475	2.408	2.252	1.966	1.474
1000	2.128	2.085	1.951	1.703	1.277
1250	1.904	1.865	1.745	1.523	1.142
1500	1.738	1.703	1.593	1.390	1.043
1714	1.626	1.593	1.490	1.300	0.975

References

- Binder, D.A. (1983), "On the variances of asymptotically normal estimators from complex surveys," *International Statistical Review*, Vol. 51, pp. 279-292.
- Kalton, G. (1977), "Practical methods for estimating survey sampling errors," *Bulletin of the International Statistical Institute*, Vol 47, 3, pp. 495-514.
- Kish, L. (1949). A procedure for objective respondent selection within the household, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, Vol. 44, pp. 380-387.
- Kish, L. (1965), *Survey Sampling*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Kish, L., & Frankel, M.R. (1974), "Inference from complex samples," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, B*, Vol. 36, pp. 1-37.
- Kish, L., & Hess, I. (1959), "On variances of ratios and their differences in multi-stage samples," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 54, pp. 416-446.
- LePage, R., & Billard, L. (1992), *Exploring the Limits of Bootstrap*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Mahalanobis, P.C. (1946), "Recent experiments in statistical sampling at the Indian Statistical Institute," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, Vol 109, pp. 325-378.

- Rao, J.N.K & Wu, C.F.J. (1988.), "Resampling inference with complex sample data," Journal of the American Statistical Association, 83, pp. 231-239.
- Rosenstone, Steven J., Kinder, Donald R., Miller, Warren E., & the National Election Studies Sample Design: Technical Memoranda, 1994 Election Study pp. 882-905 in Rosenstone, Steven J., Kinder, Donald R., Miller, Warren E., & the National Election Studies, AMERICAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY, 1994: POST-ELECTION SURVEY (ENHANCED WITH 1992 AND 1993 DATA) (Computer file). Conducted by University of Michigan Center for Political Studies. 2nd ICPSR ed. Ann Arbor MI: University of Michigan, Center for Political Studies, and Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (producer), 1995. Ann Arbor MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (distributor), 1995.
- Wolter, K.M. (1985). Introduction to Variance Estimation. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Woodruff, R.S. (1971), "A simple method for approximating the variance of a complicated estimate," Journal of the American Statistical Association, Vol. 66, pp. 411-414.

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.
- 3 Further description of the 1994 sample design can be found in "Sample Design: Technical Memoranda, 1994 Election Study" pp. 882-905 in Steven J. Rosenstone, Donald R. Kinder, Warren E. Miller and the National Election Studies. AMERICAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY, 1994: POST-ELECTION SURVEY.
- 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.

- 8 Kish, L. (1965). Survey Sampling, John Wiley & Sons, New York, NY.
- 9 Kish, L. (1949). "A procedure for objective respondent selection within the household," Journal of the American Statistical Association, Vol 44, pp. 380-387.
- 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 recombined in ways that maintained the Region boundary. This PSU actually contains the Ohio counties from both the Steubenville- Wierton, OH-WV MSA (Jefferson County, OH) and the Wheeling, WV-OH MSA (Belmont County, OH) and although it is made up of MSA counties--it is not a cohesive MSA by OMB 1990 definition.
- 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.
- 14 Kish, L. (1965). Survey Sampling, John Wiley & Sons, New York, NY.
- 15 Kish, L. (1949). "A procedure for objective respondent selection within the household," Journal of the American Statistical Association, Vol 44, pp. 380-387.
- 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 $2 \times 2 \times 3$ 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.

Target Group Order	Threat Level	Expected Respondents	Actual Respondents
First Series			
African Americans	High	138	181
	Low	138	116
Christian Fundamentalists			
	High	138	53
	Low	138	202
Second series			
African Americans	High	138	100
	Low	138	197
Christian Fundamentalists			
	High	138	114
	Low	138	141

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

demonstrated that sequences of independent random assignments to treatments are now functioning within the SRC Surveycraft CATI system.

□>> LIST OF TECHNICAL REPORTS AND OTHER OCCASIONAL PAPERS THROUGH 1996

1. Sanchez, Maria. (July 1982) "7-Point Scales."
2. Shanks, J. Merrill, Maria Sanchez, and Betsy Morton. (March 1983). "Alternative Approaches to Survey Data Collection for the National Election Studies."
3. Lake, Celinda. (September 1983) "Similarity and Representativeness of 1983 Pilot Samples."
4. Lake, Celinda. (November 1983) "Comparison of 3-point, 5-point, and 7-point Scales from the CATI Experiment 1982 Election Study."
5. NES Staff. (December 1983) "1980 Precinct Data Returns Project."
6. Lake, Celinda. (February 1984) "Coding of Independent/Independents and Apoliticals in the Party Identification Summary Code and Apoliticals in the Rolling Cross-Section."
7. Morchio, Giovanna and Maria Sanchez. (February 1984) "Creation of a Filter Variable to be Used When Analyzing Questions about Congressional Candidates in the 1982 Integrated Personal/ISR CATI/Berkeley CATI Dataset: A Report to the Board of Overseers, National Election Studies."
8. Morchio, Giovanna and Maria Sanchez. (March 1984) "Comparison of the Michigan Method of District Assignment on the Telephone with the Personal Interview Simulated Data: A Report to the Board of Overseers, National Election Studies."
9. Traugott, Santa. (June 1984) "Two Versions of the Abortion Question."
10. Sanchez, Maria. (July 1984) "Branching versus 7-point scale measurements."
11. NES Staff. (August 1984) "Weekly Field Report for the National Election Studies Continuous Monitoring, Jan. 11 - Aug. 3, 1984: A Report to the Board of Overseers, National Election Studies."
12. NES Staff. (August 1984) "Questions and Versions in NES Continuous Monitoring, 1984: A Report to the Board of Overseers, National Election Studies."
13. NES Staff. (n.d) "Years of Schooling."
14. NES Staff. (n.d) "Newspaper Code."
15. Traugott, Santa. (n.d.) "The Political Interest Variable on the 1984 Election Study." Unpublished Staff Memo to NES Planning Committee.
16. Sanchez, Maria and Giovanna Morchio. (n.d.) "Probing Don't Know Answers -- Do We Always Want to Do This?"
17. NES Staff. (February 1985) "Progress of the Rolling Cross Section."

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

18. Bowers, Jake. (February 1995) NES Pilot Study Efforts to Measure Values and Predispositions. Full text of paper in WordPerfect 6.0 is available via the NES FTP server.
19. Traugott, Santa. (February 1985) "Some Analysis of Hard-to-Reach Rolling Thunder Respondents."
20. Traugott, Santa. (April 1985) "Sample Weighting in NES Continuous Monitoring, 1984: A Report to the Board of Overseers, National Election Studies."
21. Traugott, Santa. (April 1985). "Sample Weighting in NES Pre-Post Election Survey, 1984: A Report to the Board of Overseers, National Election Studies."
22. Brehm, John. (June 1985) "Report on Coding of Economic Conditions Series in the 1984 Pre-Post Election Study"
23. Brehm, John. (July 1985). "Question Ordering Effects on Reported Vote Choice."
24. Traugott, Santa. (July 1985) "Assessment of Media Measures in RXS."
25. Traugott, Santa. (July 1985) "Assessment of Media Measures in Pre-Post"
26. Brehm, John. (August 1985). "Analysis of Result Code Disposition for Continuous Monitoring by Time in Field: Report to the Board of Overseers, National Election Studies."
27. Morchio, Giovanna, Maria Sanchez and Santa Traugott. (November 1985). "Mode Differences: DK Responses in the 1984 Post-Election Survey: A Report to the Board of Overseers, National Election Studies."
28. Morchio, Giovanna and Santa Traugott. (February 1986) "Congressional District Assignment in an RDD Sample: Results of 1982 CATI Experiment."
29. Brehm, John and Santa Traugott. (March 1986) "Similarity and Representativeness of the 1985 Pilot Half-samples."
30. Gronke, Paul. (September 1986) "NES Question C2: R's Party Registration."
31. Brehm, John. (March 1987) "How Representative is the 1986 Post-Election Survey?"
32. Morchio, Giovanna. (May 1987) "Trends in NES Response Rates."
33. Brehm, John. (December 1987) "Who's Missing? an Analysis of NonResponse in the 1986 Election Study: A Report to the Board of Overseers, National Election Studies."
34. Traugott, Santa. (August 1989) "Validating Self-Reported Vote: 1964-1988."
35. -- open --
36. Traugott, Santa and Giovanna Morchio. (March 1990) "Assessment of Bias

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
Due to Attrition and Sample Selection in the NES 1989 Pilot Study."

37. -- open --
38. Gronke, Paul. (May 1990) "Assessing the Sample Quality of the 1988 Senate Election Study: A response to Wright."
39. Presser, Stanley, Michael W. Traugott and Santa Traugott. (November 1990). "Vote 'Over' Reporting in Surveys: The Records or the Respondents?"
40. Bloom, Joel. (March 1991) "Sources of Pro-incumbent Bias in NES Survey Estimates for U.S. House Races since 1978: A Second Look."
41. Mayer, Russell. (November 1991) "Identifying Bias in Voting Models."
42. Traugott, Michael W., Santa Traugott and Stanley Presser. (May 1992) "Revalidation of Self-Reported Vote."
43. Rosenstone, Steven J., Margaret Petrella and Donald R. Kinder. (April 1993) "The Consequences of Substituting Telephone for Face-to-Face Interviewing in the 1992 National Election Study."
44. Luevano, Patricia. (March 1994) "Response Rates in the National Election Studies, 1948-1992."
45. Traugott, Santa and Steven J. Rosenstone. (Nov. 1994) "Panel Attrition Among the 1990-1992 Panel Respondents."
46. Traugott, Santa and Steven J. Rosenstone. (Nov. 1994) "Demographic Characteristics of Respondents to the 1980, 1984 and 1988 NES Pre-Election Studies by Week of Interview."
47. Traugott, Santa. (Nov. 1994) "Candidate Traits Used in NES Studies, 1979-1994."
48. Traugott, Santa. (Nov. 1994) "Affects Towards Candidates Used in NES Studies, 1979-1994."
49. Traugott, Santa. (Nov. 1994) "Candidate Placements Used in NES Studies, 1968-1994."
50. Sheng, Shing-Yuan. (Jan. 1995) "NES Measurements of Values and Pre-Dispositions, 1984-1992."
51. Traugott, Santa. (Feb. 1995) "NES Question Batteries: Measuring Values and Dispositions, 1983-1994."
52. Tolleson-Rinehart, Sue, et.al. (May 1994) "The Reliability, Validity, and Scalability of Indicators of Gender Role Beliefs and Feminism the 1992 National Election Study: A Report to the ANES Board of Overseers."

□>> LIST OF PILOT STUDY REPORTS

1991 Pilot Study Reports

Beebe, Tim. The Effects of Pre-Notification and Incentive on Panel Attrition. Undated.

Brady, Henry E. Report on Feeling Thermometer for "Moderates."
January 13, 1992.

Citrin, Jack, Donald P. Green, Beth Reingold and David O. Sears.
A Report on Measures of American Identity and New "Ethnic"
Issues in the 1991 NES Pilot Study. Undated.

Conover, Pamela J., and Virginia Sapiro. Gender Consciousness
and Gender Politics in the 1991 Pilot Study: A Report to
the ANES Board of Overseers. January, 1992.

Delli Carpini, Michael X., and Scott Keeter. An Analysis of
Information Items on the 1990 and 1991 NES Surveys: A
Report to the Board of Overseers for the National Election
Studies. January 14, 1992.

Highton, Benjamin, and Raymond E. Wolfinger. Estimating the Size
of Minority Groups. January 13, 1992.

Huddy, Leonie. Analysis of Old-Age Policy Items in the 1991
Pilot Study. Undated.

_____. Addendum. February 2, 1992.

Knack, Stephen. Social Connectedness and Voter Participation:
Evidence from the 1991 NES Pilot Study. January 1992.

_____. Social Altruism and Voter Turnout: Evidence from the
1991 NES Pilot Study. January, 1992.

_____. Performance and Recommendations Summary for 1991 NES
Pilot Variables #2828-2847. January 24, 1992.

_____. Deterring Voter Registration Through Juror Source
Practices: Evidence from the 1991 NES Pilot Study.
January, 1992.

Oliver, Eric, and Raymond E. Wolfinger. Jury Duty as a Deterrent
to Voter Registration. January 22, 1992.

Zaller, John. Report on 1991 Pilot Items on Environment.
February 2, 1992.

1993 Pilot Study Reports

Dennis, Jack. The Perot Constituency: A Report to the Board of
Overseers of the National Election Studies. March 10,
1994.

Franklin, Charles H. Report on the 1993 NES Pilot Study. March 16, 1994

Jacobson, Gary and Doug Rivers. Overreport of Vote for House
Incumbent in NES Surveys. March 11, 1994.

Strand, Douglas. Homosexuality, Gay Rights, and the Clinton
Coalition: Report to the National Election Studies on
Results from the 1993 NES Pilot Study. March 16, 1994.

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

Stoker, Laura. New Items on the 1993 Pilot Study. March 9, 1994.

Stoker, Laura. A Reconsideration of Self-Interest in American Public Opinion. Presented at the annual meeting of the Western Political Science Association. Albuquerque, New Mexico. (March 10-12, 1994)

Zaller, John. Securing the District. March 11, 1994.

1995 Pilot Study Reports

Alvarez, R. Michael. Survey Measures of Uncertainty: a Report to the National Election Studies Board on the Use of Certainty Questions to Measure Uncertainty about Candidate Traits and Issue Positions.

Bartels, Larry M. Budget Items on 1995 Pilot Study.

_____. Entertainment Television Items on 1995 Pilot Study.

_____. Humanitarianism Items on 1995 Pilot Study.

_____. Issue Scales Versus Effort Items on the 1995 Pilot Study

_____. Talk Radio Items on 1995 Pilot Study.

_____. Television News Items on 1995 Pilot Study.

Berinsky, Adam and Steven Rosenstone. Evaluation of Environmental Policy Items on the 1995 NES Pilot Study.

Buhr, Tami, Ann Crigler and Marion Just. Media Questions on the 1996 election study and related content analysis of media cover of the presidential campaign.

Hansen, John Mark. Revealed Preference Budget Items on the 1995 National Election Pilot Study: a Report.

Marcus, George E. And Michael Mackuen. Measuring Mood in the 1995 NES Pilot Study.

Rabinowitz, George and Stuart Elaine Macdonald. New Issues on the 95 Pilot Study.

Rahn, Wendy W. And John Transue. The Political Significance of Fear of Crime.

Richardson, Amy. Questions on Public Attitudes Toward the Environment.

Steenbergen, Marco R. Compassion and American Public Opinion: An Analysis of the NES Humanitarianism Scale.

Zaller, John. Analysis of News Exposure Items from the 1995 Pilot

1997 Pilot Study Reports

Barker, David. "Measures of Talk Radio Exposure and Attention."

Burden, Barry C. and Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier. "Vote Likelihood and Institutional Trait Questions in the 1997 NES Pilot Study."

- Carman, Christopher and Christopher Wlezien. "Ideological Evaluations of Government Institutions and Policy."
- Cirksena, Kathy. "Report to the Board of Overseers on Respondent Preferences for Cash Incentive in the 1997 Pilot (from Panel Debriefing" Questions)
- Rahn, Wendy and Christina Wessel. "Perceptions of the Partisan Homogeneity of Social Groups: A Report to the NES Board of Overseers."
- Sapiro, Virginia. "Pro-Life People or Opponents of Abortion? Pro-Choice People or Supporters of Abortion? A Report on the NES 1997 Pilot Study."
- Wald, Kenneth D., et al. "Evaluation of the New Religious Items on the NES 1997 Pilot Study: A Report to the NES Board."
- Wlezien, Christopher. "Liberal-Conservative Evaluations of Groups."
- Wong, Cara. "Group Closeness: 1997 National Election Study Pilot Report."

□>> 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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

- 150 prices for crops, effects of the drought
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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

- 491 ECONOMICS, THE ECONOMY
- 493 BALANCE OF TRADE; balance of payments; foreign oil
dependency (except supply of oil, see 524)
- 499 OTHER MENTION of economic, business or labor
problems
-
- 500 FOREIGN POLICY; FOREIGN AFFAIRS
- 514 LATIN AMERICA, Central America, AID TO CONTRAS
(reference to IRAN-CONTRA coded 816)
- 516 AFRICA -- starving people, overpopulation
- 517 SOUTH AFRICA -- Apartheid
- 524 MIDDLE EAST -- Iran hostages, Persian Gulf, supply
of mid-east oil (except oil dependency, see 493)
- 530 RUSSIA -- relations with, arms talks, detente;
summit, etc.
- 540 FIRMNESS in foreign policy
- 550 U.S. military involvement abroad
- 560 FOREIGN AID; amount of money given to foreign
countries; obligation to take care of our problems
at home first
- 570 AVOID WAR, establish PEACE -- any reference
- 700 DEFENSE (SPENDING); the military; quality/cost of
weapons
- 710 NUCLEAR ARMS RACE -- disarmament, SALT, INF,
threat of nuclear war; arms control
- 712 STAR WARS
- 714 SPACE PROGRAM
-
- 810 Honesty, sincerity of government officials;
corruption
- 811 Honesty, sincerity of candidates in general; e.g.,
"just making promises," "saying whatever it takes
to get elected"
- 812 Candidates are just talking (negatively) about
each other, MUD SLINGING.
- 813 How well incumbent represents/candidate would
REPRESENT THIS DISTRICT
- 814 Congressperson's personal life/morality
- 815 Candidate's ABILITY/EXPERIENCE
- 816 Candidate's (voting) RECORD
- 817 PRESIDENT CLINTON
- 818 BUSH and the IRAN-CONTRA affair
- 819 IRAN-CONTRA affair, mess, scandal, IRAN ARMS DEAL,
without reference to Bush
- 850 Which party will control the House of
Representatives; other partisan mentions
- 851 Need for change/new blood/fresh ideas in Congress;
term limits for members of Congress
- 876 PHILOSOPHICAL DIFFERENCES between the candidates -
liberal vs. conservative views; balance of
authority between state and federal government;
etc.
- 900 A local issue or concern -- the college, the dam,
the auto-insurance initiative, the leak in our
nuclear plant
- 991 1992: OTHER SPECIFIC MENTIONS OF CAMPAIGN ISSUES
- 995 1990: "There were no issues" (except 996); just
party politics
- 997 1990: OTHER SPECIFIC MENTIONS OF CAMPAIGN ISSUES

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
996 1992: INAP
1990: "There was no campaign in my district"
[Missing Data]
998 DK

□>> MASTER CODE
CAMPAIGN POLITICAL ADVERTISEMENTS

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)

029 OTHER NEGATIVE 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/issues; 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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
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

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".

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
 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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
R DESCRIBES SPECIFIC DOLE POLITICAL AD(S)

- 130 Dole ad - no other details given ("I know it was Dole's ad")
- 131 Dole ad - production details described (showed him in black and white, he was talking to some women)
- 132 Dole ad - 15% tax cut, would let people keep more of what they earn (i.e. would cut taxes)
- 133 Dole ad - war injuries, military service record
- 134 Dole ad - Russell KS values and community, personal history/life story (other than military record)
- 135 Dole ad - Dole's position on Medicare cuts
- 136 Dole ad - mention of Kemp
- 140 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
- 141 Dole ad - attacking Clinton re: Whitewater
- 142 Dole ad - attacking Clinton re: ethics of White House staff and cabinet
- 143 Dole ad - attacking Clinton re: immigration and border patrol
- 144 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
- 145 Dole ad - Attacks Clinton re: drug policies, teen drug use going up, budget cuts for drug enforcement, Clinton on MTV re: pot use
- 146 Dole ad - Attacks Clinton re: family values
- 147 Dole ad - Attacks Clinton as a liberal, closet liberal; shows Clinton saying 'I'm not a liberal'
- 148 Dole ad - other negative re: Clinton
- 149 Dole ad - other specifics

R DESCRIBES SPECIFIC CLINTON POLITICAL AD(S)

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
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

DESCRIPTION
DON'T RECALL CANDIDATE, NO SPECIFIC CANDIDATE BUT AD
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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

32 Republican candidate in open House race
33 Democratic House incumbent
34 Republican House incumbent
35 Democratic House challenger
36 Republican House challenger
41 Democratic Representative--retiring (district with open race)
42 Republican Representative--retiring (district with open race)

GOVERNOR:

[NOT USED 1992 and 1996]
50 Third party or independent Gubernatorial candidate **
51 Democratic candidate in open Gubernatorial race
52 Republican candidate in open Gubernatorial race
53 Democratic Gubernatorial incumbent
54 Republican Gubernatorial incumbent
55 Democratic Gubernatorial challenger
56 Republican Gubernatorial challenger
57 Democratic governor, no race in state
58 Republican governor, no race in state
61 Democratic governor--retiring (state with open race)
62 Republican governor--retiring (state with open race)

OTHER:

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

MISSING DATA:

98 DK; refused to name candidate
99 NA
00 INAP

++VOTED OUTSIDE DISTRICT OF IW:

DISTRICT WITH NO RUNNING INCUMBENT: (VOTE VAR ONLY)

81 Democratic candidate
82 Republican candidate

DISTRICT WITH RUNNING INCUMBENT: (VOTE VAR ONLY)

83 Democratic incumbent
84 Republican incumbent
85 Democratic challenger
86 Republican challenger

ALL DISTRICTS: (VOTE VAR ONLY)

80 Third party or independent candidate **
91 Democrat--no name given
92 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).

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

++ 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
```

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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:

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
31. Blanche Lambert Democratic candidate
32. Terry Hayes Republican candidate
41. Bill Alexander Democrat--retiring

=====

STATE: Arkansas CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 04
(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:
31. Bill McCuen Democratic candidate
32. Jay Dickey Republican candidate
41. Beryl Anthony Democrat--retiring

=====

STATE: California CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 04
(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 Malberg Democratic challenger
34. John T. Doolittle Republican incumbent

=====

STATE: California CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 06
(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. Lynn Woolsey Democratic candidate
32. Bill Filante Republican candidate
41. Barbara Boxer Democrat--retiring

=====

STATE: California CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 07
(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 Miller Democratic incumbent
36. Dave Scholl Republican challenger

=====

STATE: California CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 08
(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. Nancy Pelosi Democratic incumbent
36. Marc Wolin Republican challenger

=====

STATE: California CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 09
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
11. Barbara Boxer Democratic candidate
12. Bruce Herschensohn Republican candidate

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
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: 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:
31. Wendell H. Williams Democratic candidate
32. Bill Baker Republican candidate

=====

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. Tom Lantos Democratic incumbent
36. Jim Tomlin Republican challenger

=====

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. Pete Stark Democratic incumbent
36. Verne Teyler 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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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
=====
```

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
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

=====

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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:

35. Phil Denton Democratic challenger
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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

(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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
41. Gus Savage Democrat--retiring

=====
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
=====

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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. Herbolzheimer 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 incumbent
    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
=====

```

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

(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:

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

33. Bruce F. Vento Democratic incumbent
36. Ian Maitland Republican challenger

=====
STATE: Minnesota CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 06
(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. Gerry Sikorski Democratic incumbent
36. Rod Grams Republican challenger

=====
STATE: Missouri CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 01
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
15. Geri Rothman-Serot Democratic challenger
14. Christopher S. (Kit) Bond Republican incumbent
29. John C. Danforth Repub.--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. William L. Clay Democratic incumbent
36. Arthur S. Montgomery Republican challenger

=====
STATE: Missouri CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 02
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
15. Geri Rothman-Serot Democratic challenger
14. Christopher S. (Kit) Bond Republican incumbent
29. John C. Danforth Repub.--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. Joan Kelly Horn Democratic incumbent
36. James M. Talent Republican challenger

=====
STATE: Missouri CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 03
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
15. Geri Rothman-Serot Democratic challenger
14. Christopher S. (Kit) Bond Republican incumbent
29. John C. Danforth Repub.--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. Richard A. Gephardt Democratic incumbent
36. Mack Holeykamp Republican challenger

=====
STATE: Missouri CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 05
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
15. Geri Rothman-Serot Democratic challenger
14. Christopher S. (Kit) Bond Republican incumbent
29. John C. Danforth Repub.--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
33. Alan Wheat Democratic incumbent
36. Edward "Gomer" Moody Republican challenger

=====
STATE: Missouri CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 06
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE:
15. Geri Rothman-Serot Democratic challenger
14. Christopher S. (Kit) Bond Republican incumbent
29. John C. Danforth Repub.--term not up
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
35. Pat Danner Democratic challenger
34. Tom Coleman Republican incumbent

=====
STATE: Nebraska CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 01
(A) NAMES FOR U.S. SENATE: NO SENATE RACE
SEN. #1. Robert Kerrey Democrat--term not up 17

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

SEN. #2. J. James Exon Democrat--term not up 27
(B) NAMES FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
35. Gerry Finnegan Democratic challenger
34. Doug Bereuter Republican incumbent

=====

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:

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
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

=====

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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
=====

```

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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 incumbent
    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
=====

```

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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:

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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 Armev 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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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" Zevgolits 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:

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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. Tambllyn 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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
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 Party	Republican 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	

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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

Arizona 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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

12 Jon Kyl Republican candidate
 29 John McCain Republican -- term not up
 55 Eddie Basha Democratic challenger
 54 Fife Symington Republican incumbent

Arizona 06

33 Karan English Democratic incumbent
 36 J.D. Hayworth 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

California 04

35 Katie Hirning Democratic challenger
 34 John Doolittle 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 06

33 Lynn Woolsey Democratic incumbent
 36 Michael J. Nugent 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 08

33 Nancy Pelosi Democratic incumbent
 36 Elsa C. Cheung 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 09

33 Ronald V. Dellums Democratic incumbent
 36 Deborah Wright 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 10

35 Ellen Schwartz Democratic challenger
 34 Bill Baker 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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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

16 Michael Huffington Republican challenger
 19 Barbara Boxer Democratic -- term not up
 55 Kathleen Brown Democratic challenger
 54 Pete Wilson Republican incumbent

California 28

35 Tommy Randle Democratic challenger
 34 David Dreier 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 29

33 Henry A. Waxman Democratic incumbent
 36 Paul Stepanek 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 30

33 Xavier Becerra Democratic incumbent
 36 David A. Ramirez 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 32

33 Julian C. Dixon Democratic incumbent
 36 Ernie A. Farhat 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 33

33 Lucille Roybal-Allar Democratic 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 35

33 Maxine Waters Democratic incumbent
 36 Nate Truman 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 38

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

35	Peter Mathews	Democratic	challenger
34	Steve B. Horn	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 39

35	R.O. "Bob" Davis	Democratic	challenger
34	Ed Royce	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 40

35	Donald "Don" Rusk	Democratic	challenger
34	Jerry Lewis	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 42

33	George E. Brown, Jr.	Democratic	incumbent
36	Rob Guzman	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 43

35	Mark A. Takano	Democratic	challenger
34	Ken Calvert	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 44

31	Steve Clute	Democratic	candidate
32	Sonny Bono	Republican	candidate
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 45

35	Brett Williamson	Democratic	challenger
34	Dana Rohrabacher	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 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 P. 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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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 04

35 Cathy Kipp Democratic challenger
 34 Wayne Allard Republican incumbent
 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 06

35 John Hallen Democratic challenger
 34 Dan Schaefer Republican incumbent
 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

Connecticut 03

33 Rosa L. DeLauro Democratic incumbent
 36 Susan E. Johnson Republican challenger
 13 Joe Lieberman Democratic incumbent
 16 Jerry Labriola Republican challenger
 19 Christopher Dodd Democratic -- term not up
 51 Bill Curry Democratic candidate
 52 John G. Rowland Republican candidate

Florida 02

33 Pete Peterson Democratic incumbent
 36 Carole Griffin Republican challenger
 15 Hugh E. Rodham Democratic challenger
 14 Connie Mack Republican incumbent
 19 Bob Graham Democratic -- term not up
 53 Lawton Chiles Democratic incumbent
 56 Jeb Bush Republican challenger

Florida 03

33 Corrine Brown Democratic incumbent
 36 Marc Little Republican challenger
 15 Hugh E. Rodham Democratic challenger
 14 Connie Mack Republican incumbent
 19 Bob Graham Democratic -- term not up
 53 Lawton Chiles Democratic incumbent
 56 Jeb Bush Republican challenger

Florida 04

34 Tillie Fowler Republican incumbent
 15 Hugh E. Rodham Democratic challenger
 14 Connie Mack Republican incumbent
 19 Bob Graham Democratic -- term not up
 53 Lawton Chiles Democratic incumbent
 56 Jeb Bush Republican challenger

Florida 06

34 Clifford B. Stearns Republican incumbent
 15 Hugh E. Rodham Democratic challenger

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

14 Connie Mack Republican incumbent
 19 Bob Graham Democratic -- term not up
 53 Lawton Chiles Democratic incumbent
 56 Jeb Bush Republican challenger

Florida 12

35 Robert Connors Democratic challenger
 34 Charles T. Canady Republican incumbent
 15 Hugh E. Rodham Democratic challenger
 14 Connie Mack Republican incumbent
 19 Bob Graham Democratic -- term not up
 53 Lawton Chiles Democratic incumbent
 56 Jeb Bush Republican challenger

Florida 13

34 Dan Miller Republican incumbent
 15 Hugh E. Rodham Democratic challenger
 14 Connie Mack Republican incumbent
 19 Bob Graham Democratic -- term not up
 53 Lawton Chiles Democratic incumbent
 56 Jeb Bush Republican challenger

Florida 15

31 Sue Munsey Democratic candidate
 32 Dave Weldon Republican candidate
 15 Hugh E. Rodham Democratic challenger
 14 Connie Mack Republican incumbent
 19 Bob Graham Democratic -- term not up
 53 Lawton Chiles Democratic incumbent
 56 Jeb Bush Republican challenger

Florida 16

31 John P. Comerford Democratic candidate
 32 Mark Foley Republican candidate
 15 Hugh E. Rodham Democratic challenger
 14 Connie Mack Republican incumbent
 19 Bob Graham Democratic -- term not up
 53 Lawton Chiles Democratic incumbent
 56 Jeb Bush Republican challenger

Florida 17

33 Carrie P. Meek Democratic incumbent
 15 Hugh E. Rodham Democratic challenger
 14 Connie Mack Republican incumbent
 19 Bob Graham Democratic -- term not up
 53 Lawton Chiles Democratic incumbent
 56 Jeb Bush Republican challenger

Florida 18

34 Ileana Ros-Lehtinen Republican incumbent
 15 Hugh E. Rodham Democratic challenger
 14 Connie Mack Republican incumbent
 19 Bob Graham Democratic -- term not up
 53 Lawton Chiles Democratic incumbent
 56 Jeb Bush Republican challenger

Florida 21

34 Lincoln Diaz-Balart Republican incumbent
 15 Hugh E. Rodham Democratic challenger

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

14	Connie Mack	Republican incumbent
19	Bob Graham	Democratic -- term not up
53	Lawton Chiles	Democratic incumbent
56	Jeb Bush	Republican challenger

Florida 22

35	Hermine L. Wiener	Democratic challenger
34	E. Clay Shaw, Jr.	Republican incumbent
15	Hugh E. Rodham	Democratic challenger
14	Connie Mack	Republican incumbent
19	Bob Graham	Democratic -- term not up
53	Lawton Chiles	Democratic incumbent
56	Jeb Bush	Republican challenger

Georgia 01

35	Raymond Beckworth	Democratic challenger
34	Jack Kingston	Republican incumbent
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 02

33	Sanford D. Bishop, J	Democratic incumbent
36	John Clayton	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 03

35	Fred R. Overby	Democratic challenger
34	Mac Collins	Republican incumbent
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 04

35	Comer Yates	Democratic challenger
34	John Linder	Republican incumbent
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 05

33	John Lewis	Democratic incumbent
36	Dale Dixon	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 06

35	Ben Jones	Democratic challenger
34	Newt Gingrich	Republican incumbent
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	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
	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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

33 Luis V. Gutierrez Democratic incumbent
 36 Steven Valtierra 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 05

33 Dan Rostenkowski Democratic incumbent
 36 Michael Patrick Flan 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 06

35 Tom Berry Democratic challenger
 34 Henry J. Hyde Republican 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 08

35 Robert C. Walberg Democratic challenger
 34 Philip M. Crane Republican 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 09

33 Sidney R. Yates Democratic incumbent
 36 George Edward Larney 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 10

35 Andrew Krupp Democratic challenger
 34 John Edward Porter Republican 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 12

33 Jerry F. Costello Democratic incumbent
 36 Jan Morris 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 13

35 William A. Riley Democratic challenger
 34 Harris W. Fawell Republican incumbent

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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 19

33 Glenn Poshard Democratic incumbent
 36 Brent Winters 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

Indiana 02

31 Joseph H. Hogsett Democratic candidate
 32 David M. McIntosh Republican candidate
 15 Jim Jontz Democratic challenger
 14 Richard G. Lugar Republican incumbent
 29 Daniel Coats Republican -- term not up
 57 Evan Bayh Democratic -- term not up

Indiana 04

33 Jill L. Long Democratic incumbent
 36 Mark Edward Souder Republican challenger
 15 Jim Jontz Democratic challenger
 14 Richard G. Lugar Republican incumbent
 29 Daniel Coats Republican -- term not up
 57 Evan Bayh Democratic -- term not up

Indiana 06

35 Natalie M. Bruner Democratic challenger
 34 Dan Burton Republican incumbent
 15 Jim Jontz Democratic challenger
 14 Richard G. Lugar Republican incumbent
 29 Daniel Coats Republican -- term not up
 57 Evan Bayh Democratic -- term not up

Indiana 09

33 Lee H. Hamilton Democratic incumbent
 36 Jean Leising Republican challenger
 15 Jim Jontz Democratic challenger
 14 Richard G. Lugar Republican incumbent
 29 Daniel Coats Republican -- term not up
 57 Evan Bayh Democratic -- term not up

Kansas 02

31 John Carlin Democratic candidate
 32 Sam Brownback Republican candidate
 18 Nancy Landon Kassebaum Republican -- term not up
 28 Robert Dole Republican -- term not up
 51 Jim Slattery Democratic candidate
 52 Bill Graves Republican candidate

Kansas 03

35 Judy Hancock Democratic challenger
 34 Jan Meyers Republican incumbent
 18 Nancy Landon Kassebaum Republican -- term not up
 28 Robert Dole Republican -- term not up
 51 Jim Slattery Democratic candidate

52	Bill Graves	Republican candidate
	Kansas	04
33	Dan Glickman	Democratic incumbent
36	Todd Tiaht	Republican challenger
18	Nancy Landon Kassebaum	Republican -- term not up
28	Robert Dole	Republican -- term not up
51	Jim Slattery	Democratic candidate
52	Bill Graves	Republican candidate
	Kansas	04
33	Dan Glickman	Democratic incumbent
36	Todd Tiaht	Republican challenger
18	Nancy Landon Kassebaum	Republican -- term not up
28	Robert Dole	Republican -- term not up
51	Jim Slattery	Democratic candidate
52	Bill Graves	Republican candidate
	Kentucky	06
33	Scotty Baesler	Democratic incumbent
36	Matthew Eric Wills	Republican challenger
18	Mitch McConnell	Republican -- term not up
17	Wendell H. Ford	Democratic -- term not up
57	Brereton C. Jones	Democratic -- term not up
	Louisiana	04
35	Darryl Baker	Democratic challenger
34	Richard H. Baker	Republican incumbent
17	J. Bennett Johnston	Democratic -- term not up
27	John B. Breaux	Democratic -- term not up
57	Edwin W. Edwards	Democratic -- term not up
	Massachusetts	01
33	John W. Olver	Democratic incumbent
13	Edward Kennedy	Democratic incumbent
16	W. Mitt Romney	Republican challenger
19	John Kerry	Democratic -- term not up
55	Mark Roosevelt	Democratic challenger
54	William F. Weld	Republican incumbent
	Massachusetts	02
33	Richard E. Neal	Democratic incumbent
36	John W. Briare	Republican challenger
13	Edward Kennedy	Democratic incumbent
16	W. Mitt Romney	Republican challenger
19	John Kerry	Democratic -- term not up
55	Mark Roosevelt	Democratic challenger
54	William F. Weld	Republican incumbent
	Massachusetts	06
35	John F. Tierney	Democratic challenger
34	Peter G. Torkildsen	Republican incumbent
13	Edward Kennedy	Democratic incumbent
16	W. Mitt Romney	Republican challenger
19	John Kerry	Democratic -- term not up
55	Mark Roosevelt	Democratic challenger
54	William F. Weld	Republican incumbent

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

33	Joseph P. Kennedy II	Democratic incumbent
13	Edward Kennedy	Democratic incumbent
16	W. Mitt Romney	Republican challenger
19	John Kerry	Democratic -- term not up
55	Mark Roosevelt	Democratic challenger
54	William F. Weld	Republican incumbent

Massachusetts 10

33	Gerry E. Studds	Democratic incumbent
36	Keith Jason Hemeon	Republican challenger
13	Edward Kennedy	Democratic incumbent
16	W. Mitt Romney	Republican challenger
19	John Kerry	Democratic -- term not up
55	Mark Roosevelt	Democratic challenger
54	William F. Weld	Republican incumbent

Maryland 02

31	Gerry L. Brewster	Democratic candidate
32	Robert L. Ehrlich, J	Republican candidate
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

Maryland 03

33	Benjamin L. Cardin	Democratic incumbent
36	Robert Ryan Tousey	Republican challenger
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

Maryland 04

33	Albert R. Wynn	Democratic incumbent
36	Michele Dyson	Republican challenger
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

Maryland 05

33	Steny H. Hoyer	Democratic incumbent
36	Donald Devine	Republican challenger
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

Maryland 06

35	Paul Muldowney	Democratic challenger
34	Roscoe G. Bartlett	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
	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
	Michigan	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
	Michigan	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
	Michigan	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
	Michigan	09
33	Dale E. Kildee	Democratic incumbent
36	Megan O'Neill	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	10
33	David E. Bonior	Democratic incumbent
36	David J. Lobsinger	Republican challenger

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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 Breshgold 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 Wynn 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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

Minnesota		02	
33	David Minge	Democratic	incumbent
36	Gary B. Revier	Republican	challenger
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

Minnesota		04	
33	Bruce F. Vento	Democratic	incumbent
36	Dennis Newinski	Republican	challenger
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

Minnesota		05	
33	Martin Olav Sabo	Democratic	incumbent
36	Dorothy Legrand	Republican	challenger
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

Minnesota		06	
31	William P. "Bill" Lu	Democratic	candidate
32	Tad Jude	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

Minnesota		08	
33	James L. Oberstar	Democratic	incumbent
36	Phil Herwig	Republican	challenger
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

Missouri		02	
35	Pat Kelly	Democratic	challenger
34	James M. Talent	Republican	incumbent
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		03	
33	Richard A. Gephardt	Democratic	incumbent
36	Gary Gill	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 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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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 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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

	New Jersey 07	
35	Karen Carroll	Democratic challenger
34	Bob Franks	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
	New Jersey 09	
33	Robert G. Torricelli	Democratic incumbent
36	Peter J. Russo	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 10	
33	Donald M. Payne	Democratic incumbent
36	Jim Ford	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 11	
31	Frank Herbert	Democratic candidate
32	Rodney P. Frelinghuy	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 13	
33	Robert Menendez	Democratic incumbent
36	Fernando A. Alonso	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 York 01	
33	George J. Hochbrueck	Democratic incumbent
36	Michael Forbes	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 02	
35	James Manfre	Democratic challenger
34	Rick A. Lazio	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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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

53	Mario M. Cuomo	Democratic incumbent
56	George E. Pataki	Republican challenger
	New York	11
33	Major R. Owens	Democratic incumbent
36	Gary S. Popkin	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	14
33	Carolyn B. Maloney	Democratic incumbent
36	Charles Millard	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	16
33	Jose E. Serrano	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	17
33	Eliot L. Engel	Democratic incumbent
36	Edward T. Marshall	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	18
33	Nita M. Lowey	Democratic incumbent
36	Andrew C. Hartzell,	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	19
31	Sue W. Kelly	Democratic candidate
32	Hamilton Fish, Jr.	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	27
35	William A. Long Jr.	Democratic challenger
34	Bill Paxon	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 29

33 John J. LaFalce Democratic incumbent
 36 William E. Miller 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 30

35 David Franczyk Democratic challenger
 34 Jack Quinn 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 31

34 Amo Houghton 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

Ohio 03

33 Tony P. Hall Democratic incumbent
 36 David A. Westbrook Republican challenger
 11 Joel Hyatt Democratic candidate
 12 Mike DeWine Republican candidate
 19 John H. Glenn, Jr. Democratic -- term not up
 55 Robert L. Burch, Jr. Democratic challenger
 54 George V. Voinovich Republican incumbent

Ohio 07

34 David L. Hobson Republican incumbent
 11 Joel Hyatt Democratic candidate
 12 Mike DeWine Republican candidate
 19 John H. Glenn, Jr. Democratic -- term not up
 55 Robert L. Burch, Jr. Democratic challenger
 54 George V. Voinovich Republican incumbent

Ohio 08

34 John Andrew Boehner Republican incumbent
 11 Joel Hyatt Democratic candidate
 12 Mike DeWine Republican 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

32 Bob Ney Republican candidate
 11 Joel Hyatt Democratic candidate
 12 Mike DeWine Republican candidate
 19 John H. Glenn, Jr. Democratic -- term not up
 55 Robert L. Burch, Jr Democratic challenger
 54 George V. Voinovich Republican incumbent

Oklahoma 01

31 Stuart Price Democratic candidate
 32 Steve Largent Republican candidate
 11 Dave McCurdy Democratic candidate
 12 James Inhofe Republican candidate
 29 Don Nickles Republican -- term not up
 51 Jack Mildren Democratic candidate
 52 Frank Keating Republican candidate

Oklahoma 02

31 Virgil R. Cooper Democratic candidate
 32 Tom Coburn Republican candidate
 11 Dave McCurdy Democratic candidate
 12 James Inhofe Republican candidate
 29 Don Nickles Republican -- term not up
 51 Jack Mildren Democratic candidate
 52 Frank Keating Republican candidate

Oklahoma 02

31 Virgil R. Cooper Democratic candidate
 32 Tom Coburn Republican candidate
 11 Dave McCurdy Democratic candidate
 12 James Inhofe Republican candidate
 29 Don Nickles Republican -- term not up
 51 Jack Mildren Democratic candidate
 52 Frank Keating Republican candidate

Oregon 01

33 Elizabeth Furse Democratic incumbent
 36 Bill Witt Republican challenger
 18 Mark O. Hatfield Republican -- term not up
 28 Bob Packwood Republican -- term not up
 51 John Kitzhaber Democratic candidate
 52 Denny Smith Republican candidate

Oregon 03

33 Ron Wyden Democratic incumbent
 36 Everett Hall Republican challenger
 18 Mark O. Hatfield Republican -- term not up
 28 Bob Packwood Republican -- term not up
 51 John Kitzhaber Democratic candidate
 52 Denny Smith Republican candidate

Oregon 04

33 Peter A. DeFazio Democratic incumbent
 36 John D. Newkirk Republican challenger
 18 Mark O. Hatfield Republican -- term not up
 28 Bob Packwood Republican -- term not up
 51 John Kitzhaber Democratic candidate
 52 Denny Smith Republican candidate

Pennsylvania 01

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

33	Thomas M. Foglietta	Democratic incumbent
36	Roger Gordon	Republican challenger
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

Pennsylvania 02

31	Chaka Fattah	Democratic candidate
32	Lawrence R. Watson	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

Pennsylvania 08

35	John P. Murray	Democratic challenger
34	James C. Greenwood	Republican incumbent
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

Pennsylvania 12

33	John P. Murtha	Democratic incumbent
36	Bill Choby	Republican challenger
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

Pennsylvania 13

33	Marjorie Margolies-M	Democratic incumbent
36	Jon D. Fox	Republican challenger
13	Harris Wofford	Democratic incumbent
16	Rick Santorum	Republican challenger
29	Arlen Specter	Republican -- term not up
/s(1). 51	Mark Singel	Democratic candidate
52	Tom Ridge	Republican candidate

Pennsylvania 14

33	William J. Coyne	Democratic incumbent
36	John Robert Clark	Republican challenger
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

Pennsylvania 17

34	George W. Gekas	Republican incumbent
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
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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

33 Jim Chapman Democratic incumbent
 36 Mike Blankenship 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 03

34 Sam Johnson 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 06

35 Terry Jesmore Democratic challenger
 34 Joe L. Barton 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 07

34 Bill Archer 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 08

34 Jack Fields 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 09

33 Jack Brooks Democratic incumbent
 36 Steve Stockman 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 11

33 Chet Edwards Democratic incumbent
 36 Jim Broyles 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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

Texas 12
 33 Pete Geren Democratic incumbent
 36 Ernest J. Anderson 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 13
 33 Bill Sarpalius Democratic incumbent
 36 William M. "Mac" Thornberry 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 14
 33 Greg Laughlin Democratic incumbent
 36 Jim Deats 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 15
 33 E. "Kika" de la Garza Democratic incumbent
 36 Tom Haughey 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 18
 31 Sheila Jackson Lee Democratic candidate
 32 Jerry Burley Republican candidate
 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 21
 34 Lamar Smith 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 25
 31 Ken Bentsen Democratic candidate
 32 Gene Fontenot Republican candidate
 15 Richard Fisher Democratic challenger
 14 Kay Bailey Hutchinson Republican incumbent

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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 Armev 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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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. Demcratic 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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

		Washington	07	
33	Jim McDermott	Democratic	incumbent	
36	Keith Harris	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	08	
35	Jim Wyrick	Democratic	challenger	
34	Jennifer Dunn	Republican	incumbent	
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	09	
33	Mike Kriedler	Democratic	incumbent	
36	Randy Tate	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	
		Wisconsin	01	
33	Peter W. Barca	Democratic	incumbent	
36	Mark W. Neumann	Republican	challenger	
13	Herb Kohl	Democratic	incumbent	
16	Robert T. Welch	Republican	challenger	
19	Russell Feingold	Democratic	-- term not up	
55	Chuck Chvala	Democratic	challenger	
54	Tommy G. Thompson	Republican	incumbent	
		Wisconsin	04	
33	Gerald D. Kleczka	Democratic	incumbent	
36	Tom Reynolds	Republican	challenger	
13	Herb Kohl	Democratic	incumbent	
16	Robert T. Welch	Republican	challenger	
19	Russell Feingold	Democratic	-- term not up	
55	Chuck Chvala	Democratic	challenger	
54	Tommy G. Thompson	Republican	incumbent	
		Wisconsin	05	
33	Thomas M. Barrett	Democratic	incumbent	
36	Stephen B. Hollingsh	Republican	challenger	
13	Herb Kohl	Democratic	incumbent	
16	Robert T. Welch	Republican	challenger	
19	Russell Feingold	Democratic	-- term not up	
55	Chuck Chvala	Democratic	challenger	
54	Tommy G. Thompson	Republican	incumbent	
		Wisconsin	09	
34	F. James Sensenbrenner	Republican	incumbent	
13	Herb Kohl	Democratic	incumbent	
16	Robert T. Welch	Republican	challenger	
19	Russell Feingold	Democratic	-- term not up	
55	Chuck Chvala	Democratic	challenger	
54	Tommy G. Thompson	Republican	incumbent	

West Virginia 01

33	Alan B. Mollohan	Democratic incumbent
36	Sally Rossy Riley	Republican challenger
13	Robert C. Byrd	Democratic incumbent
16	Stan Klos	Republican challenger
19	John D. Rockefeller	Democratic -- term not up
57	Gaston Caperton	Democratic -- term not up

Wyoming 01

31	Bob Schuster	Democratic candidate
32	Barbara Cubin	Republican candidate
11	Mike Sullivan	Democratic candidate
12	Craig Thomas	Republican candidate
29	Alan Simpson	Republican -- term not up
51	Kathy Karpan	Democratic candidate
52	Jim Geringer	Republican candidate

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

(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 Earl E. Hilliard Democratic incumbent
 36 Joe Powell Republican challenger

 State: Arizona Congressional District: 1

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:

34 Matt Salmon Republican incumbent

 State: Arizona Congressional District: 2

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:

33 Ed Pastor Democratic incumbent
 36 Jim Buster Republican challenger

 State: Arizona Congressional District: 3

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:

35 Alexander Schneider Democratic challenger
 34 Bob Stump Republican incumbent

 State: Arizona Congressional District: 4

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:

35 Maria Elena Milton Democratic challenger
 34 John Shadegg Republican incumbent

 State: Arizona Congressional District: 6

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:

35 Steve Owens Democratic challenger
 34 J.D. Hayworth Republican incumbent

 State: Arkansas Congressional District: 4

(A) Names for U.S. Senate:

11 Winston Bryant Democratic candidate
 12 Tim Hutchinson Republican candidate
 21 David Pryor Democrat -- retiring

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:

35 Vincent Tolliver Democratic challenger
 34 Jay Dickey Republican incumbent

 State: California Congressional District: 3

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:

33 Vic Fazio Democratic incumbent
 36 Tim LeFever Republican challenger

 State: California Congressional District: 4

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:

35 Katie Hirning Democratic challenger
 34 John T. Doolittle Republican incumbent

 State: California Congressional District: 6

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:

33 Lynn Woolsey Democratic incumbent
 36 Duane C. Hughes Republican challenger

 State: California Congressional District: 8

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:

33 Nancy Pelosi Democratic incumbent

36 Justin Raimondo Republican challenger

 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

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:

33 Henry A. Waxman Democratic incumbent
 36 Paul Stepanek Republican challenger

 State: California Congressional District: 32

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:

33 Julian C. Dixon Democratic incumbent
 36 Larry Ardito Republican challenger

 State: California Congressional District: 33

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:

33 Lucille Roybal-Allard Democratic incumbent
 36 John P. Leonard Republican challenger

 State: California Congressional District: 35

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:

33 Maxine Waters Democratic incumbent
 36 Eric Carlson Republican challenger

 State: California Congressional District: 36

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:

33 Jane Harman Democratic incumbent
 36 Susan Brooks Republican challenger

 State: California Congressional District: 38

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:

35 Rick Zbur Democratic challenger
 34 Steve Horn Republican incumbent

 State: California Congressional District: 39

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:

35 R.O. (Bob) Davis Democratic challenger
 34 Ed Royce Republican incumbent

 State: California Congressional District: 40

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:

35 Robert (Bob) Conaway Democratic challenger
 34 Jerry Lewis Republican incumbent

 State: California Congressional District: 42

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:

33 George E. Brown Jr. Democratic incumbent
 36 Linda M. Wilde Republican challenger

 State: California Congressional District: 44

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:

35 Anita Rufus Democratic challenger
 34 Sonny Bono Republican incumbent

 State: California Congressional District: 45

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:

35 Sally J. Alexander Democratic challenger
 34 Dana Rohrabacher Republican incumbent

 State: California Congressional District: 46

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:

35 Loretta Sanchez Democratic challenger
 34 Robert K. Dornan Republican incumbent

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:

34 Tillie Fowler Republican incumbent

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 -- retriing
 (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 -- retriing
 (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 -- retriing
 (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 -- retriing
 (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:

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 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 -- retriing
 (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 -- retriing
 (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 -- retriing
 (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 -- retriing
 (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 -- retriing
 (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 -- retriing
 (B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:

35 Clem Balanoff Democratic challenger
 34 Jerry Weller Republican incumbent

 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 -- retriing

(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 -- retriing

(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 -- retriing

(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 Trammell 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:

33 Lee H. Hamilton Democratic incumbent
 36 Jean Leising Republican challenger

 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 -- retriing

(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:

33 Albert R. Wynn Democratic incumbent
 36 John B. Kimble Republican challenger

 State: Maryland Congressional District: 5

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:

33 Steny H. Hoyer Democratic incumbent
 36 John S. Morgan Republican challenger

 State: Maryland Congressional District: 6

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:

35 Stephen Crawford Democratic challenger
 34 Roscoe G. Bartlett Republican incumbent

 State: Maryland Congressional District: 7

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:

31 Elijah E. Cummings Democratic candidate
 32 Kenneth Kondner Republican candidate
 41 Kweisi Mfume Democrat -- retiring

 State: Maryland Congressional District: 8

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:

35 Donald Mooers Democratic challenger
 34 Constance A. Morella Republican incumbent

 State: Massachusetts Congressional District: 1

(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 John W. Olver Democratic incumbent
 36 Jane Swift Republican challenger

 State: Massachusetts Congressional District: 2

(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 Richard E. Neal Democratic incumbent
 36 Mark Steele Republican challenger

 State: Massachusetts Congressional District: 3

(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:

35 Jim McGovern Democratic challenger
 34 Peter I. Blute Republican incumbent

 State: Massachusetts Congressional District: 6

(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:

35 John Tierney Democratic challenger
 34 Peter G. Torkildsen Republican incumbent

 State: Massachusetts Congressional District: 8

(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 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:

35 Kim H. Tunnickliff 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 P. 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

 State: Missouri Congressional District: 3
 (B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
 33 Richard A. Gephardt Democratic incumbent
 36 Deborah Lynn Wheelahan 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

(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
31 Joe Keefe Democratic candidate
32 John E. Sununu Republican candidate
42 Bill Zeliff Republican -- retiring

State: New Hampshire Congressional District: 2

(A) Names for U.S. Senate:
15 Dick Swett Democratic challenger
14 Robert C. Smith Republican incumbent
(B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
35 Deborah (Arnie) Arensen Democratic challenger
34 Charles Bass Republican incumbent

State: New Jersey Congressional District: 1

(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 E. Andrews Democratic incumbent
36 Sophia A. Nelson Republican challenger

State: New Jersey Congressional District: 2

(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 Ruth Katz Democratic challenger
34 Frank A. LoBiondo Republican incumbent

State: New Jersey Congressional District: 7

(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 Larry Lerner Democratic challenger
34 Bob Franks Republican incumbent

State: New Jersey Congressional District: 9

(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 Steven R. Rothman Democratic candidate
32 Kathleen A. Donovan Republican candidate
41 Robert G. Torricelli Democrat -- retiring

State: New Jersey Congressional District: 10

(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 Donald M. Payne Democratic incumbent
36 Vanessa Williams Republican challenger

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 Ameila 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:

35 Thomas M. Fricano Democratic challenger
 34 Bill Paxon Republican incumbent

 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

36 David A. Westbrook Republican challenger

 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 Steven C. LaTourette 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:

33 William J. Coyne Democratic incumbent
 36 Bill Ravotti Republican challenger

 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

36 Steven L. Edmondson Republican challenger

 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

 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 Armev 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:

15 Mark Warner Democratic challenger
 14 John W. Warner Republican incumbent
 (B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
 33 Owen B. Pickett Democratic incumbent
 36 John Tate Republican challenger

 State: Virginia Congressional District: 3
 (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:
 33 Robert C. Scott Democratic incumbent
 36 Elsie Holland Republican challenger

 State: Virginia Congressional District: 4
 (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:
 33 Norman Sisisky Democratic incumbent
 36 A.J. (Tony) Zevgolis Republican challenger

 State: Virginia Congressional District: 5
 (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:
 31 Virgil Goode Democratic candidate
 32 George C. Landrith III Republican candidate
 41 Lewis F. Payne Democrat -- retiring

 State: Virginia Congressional District: 6
 (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 Jeffrey Grey Democratic challenger
 34 Robert W. Goodlatte Republican incumbent

 State: Virginia Congressional District: 7
 (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 Roderic H. Slayton Democratic challenger
 34 Thomas J. Bliley Jr. Republican incumbent

 State: Virginia Congressional District: 8
 (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:
 33 James P. Moran Democratic incumbent
 36 John Otey Republican challenger

 State: Virginia Congressional District: 9
 (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:

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:

13 Jay Rockefeller Democratic incumbent
 16 Betty A. Burks Republican challenger
 (B) Names for U.S. House of Representatives:
 33 Nick J. Rahall II Democratic incumbent
 36 Sharon Lord Republican challenger

 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
 (A) Names for U.S. Senate:
 11 Kathy Karpan Democratic candidate
 12 Michael B. Enzi Republican candidate
 22 Alan Simpson Republican -- retiring
 (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 Party Republican Party

CANDIDATES FOR THE
 U.S. HOUSE OF
 REPRESENTATIVES:
 CANDIDATES FOR THE
 U.S. SENATE:

Robert E. Andrews Sophia A. Nelson
 Robert G. Torricelli Dick Zimmer

BALLOT CARD
 For the November 1996 General Election
 =====

State: Kansas
 Congressional District: 01
 Democratic Party Republican Party

CANDIDATES FOR THE
U.S. HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES:
CANDIDATES FOR THE
U.S. SENATE:

John Divine	Jerry Moran
Sally Thompson	Pat Roberts

CANDIDATES FOR THE
U.S. SENATE:

Jill Docking	Sam Brownback
--------------	---------------

BALLOT CARD
For the November 1996 General Election
=====

State: New York
Congressional District: 01
Democratic Party Republican Party

CANDIDATES FOR THE
U.S. HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES:

Nora Bredes	Michael P. Forbes
-------------	-------------------

□>> 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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
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 cand
97 Candidate name given but office and party NA
98 DK
99 NA

+++ NAMES USED ONLY IN ERROR BY R

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
*** TO BE USED ONLY WHEN CANDIDATE APPEARS ON CANDIDATE

□>> MASTER CODE
1990 CENSUS DEFINITIONS

THIS NOTE CONTAINS DEFINITIONS OF THE FOLLOWING TERMS
USED BY THE 1990 U.S. CENSUS OF POPULATION:

Metropolitan Statistical Areas
Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Areas
Urbanized Areas
Places
Incorporated Places
Unincorporated Places

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
Detroit, MI PMSA*

* In the SRC 1980 National Sample (1992 NES sample).

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).

□>> MASTER CODE
CENSUS OCCUPATION CODES

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)

- 025 OTHER FINANCIAL OFFICERS (1415, 1419)
 - 026 MANAGEMENT ANALYSTS (142)
 - 027 PERSONNEL, TRAINING, AND LABOR RELATIONS SPECIALISTS (143)
 - 028 PURCHASING AGENTS AND BUYERS, FARM PRODUCTS (1443)
 - 029 BUYERS, WHOLESALE AND RETAIL TRADE, EXCEPT FARM PRODUCTS (1442)
 - 033 PURCHASING AGENTS AND BUYERS, N.E.C. (1449)
 - 034 BUSINESS AND PROMOTION AGENTS (145)
 - 035 CONSTRUCTION INSPECTORS (1472)
 - 036 INSPECTORS AND COMPLIANCE OFFICERS, EXC. CONSTRUCTION (1473)
 - 037 MANAGEMENT RELATED OCCUPATIONS, N.E.C. (149)
-

Professional Specialty Occupations

.....

- engineers, architects and surveyors -

(043) THROUGH (063) ARE RECODED TO: 03

- 043 ARCHITECTS (161)

ENGINEERS

- 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)

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

074 ATMOSPHERIC AND SPACE SCIENTISTS (1846)
075 GEOLOGISTS AND GEODESISTS (1847)
076 PHYSICAL SCIENTISTS, N.E.C. (1849)
077 AGRICULTURAL AND FOOD SCIENTISTS (1853)
078 BIOLOGICAL AND LIFE SCIENTISTS (1854)
079 FORESTRY AND CONSERVATION SCIENTISTS (1852)
083 MEDICAL SCIENTISTS (1855)

- health diagnosing occupations -

(084) THROUGH (089) ARE RECODED TO: 06

084 PHYSICIANS (261)
085 DENTISTS (262)
086 VETERINARIANS (27)
087 OPTOMETRISTS (281)
088 PODIATRISTS (283)
089 HEALTH DIAGNOSING PRACTITIONERS, N.E.C. (289)

- health assessment and treating occupations -

(095) THROUGH (106) ARE RECODED TO: 07

095 REGISTERED NURSES (29)
096 PHARMACISTS (301)
097 DIETITIANS (302)

THERAPISTS

098 INHALATION THERAPISTS (3031)
099 OCCUPATIONAL THERAPISTS (3032)
103 PHYSICAL THERAPISTS (3033)
104 SPEECH THERAPISTS (3034)
105 THERAPISTS, N.E.C. (3039)
106 PHYSICIANS' ASSISTANTS (304)

- teachers, postsecondary -

(113) THROUGH (154) ARE RECODED TO: 08

113 EARTH, ENVIRONMENTAL AND MARINE SCIENCE TEACHERS
(2212)
114 BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE TEACHERS (2213)
115 CHEMISTRY TEACHERS (2214)
116 PHYSICS TEACHERS (2215)
117 NATURAL SCIENCE TEACHERS, N.E.C. (2216)
118 PSYCHOLOGY TEACHERS (2217)
119 ECONOMICS TEACHERS (2218)
123 HISTORY TEACHERS (2222)
124 POLITICAL SCIENCE TEACHERS (2223)
125 SOCIOLOGY TEACHERS (2224)
126 SOCIAL SCIENCE TEACHERS, N.E.C. (2225)
127 ENGINEERING TEACHERS (2226)
128 MATHEMATICAL SCIENCE TEACHERS (2227)
129 COMPUTER SCIENCE TEACHERS (2228)
133 MEDICAL SCIENCE TEACHERS (2231)

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

134 HEALTH SPECIALTIES TEACHERS (2232)
135 BUSINESS, COMMERCE, AND MARKETING TEACHERS (2233)
136 AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY TEACHERS (2234)
137 ART, DRAMA, AND MUSIC TEACHERS (2235)
138 PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHERS (2236)
139 EDUCATION TEACHERS (2237)
143 ENGLISH TEACHERS (2238)
144 FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHERS (2242)
145 LAW TEACHERS (2243)
146 SOCIAL WORK TEACHERS (2244)
147 THEOLOGY TEACHERS (2245)
148 TRADE AND INDUSTRIAL TEACHERS (2246)
149 HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS (2247)
153 TEACHERS, POSTSECONDARY, N.E.C. (2249)
154 POSTSECONDARY TEACHERS, SUBJECT NOT SPECIFIED

- teachers, except postsecondary -

(155) THROUGH (165) ARE RECODED TO: 09

155 TEACHERS, PREKINDERGARTEN AND KINDERGARTEN (231)
156 TEACHERS, ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (232)
157 TEACHERS, SECONDARY SCHOOL (233)
158 TEACHERS, SPECIAL EDUCATION (235)
159 TEACHERS, N.E.C. (236,239)
163 COUNSELORS, EDUCATIONAL AND VOCATIONAL (24)
LIBRARIANS, ARC 223 BIOLOGICAL TECHNICIANS
(382)
224 CHEMICAL TECHNICIANS (3831)
225 SCIENCE TECHNICIANS, N.E.C. (3832, 3833, 384, 389)

- technicians, except health, engineering, and science -

(226) THROUGH (235) ARE RECODED TO: 17

226 AIRPLANE PILOTS AND NAVIGATORS (825)
227 AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS (392)
228 BROADCAST EQUIPMENT OPERATORS (393)
229 COMPUTER PROGRAMMERS (3971, 3972)
233 TOOL PROGRAMMERS, NUMERICAL CONTROL (3974)
234 LEGAL ASSISTANTS (396)
235 TECHNICIANS, N.E.C. (399)

SALES OCCUPATIONS

Supervisors and Proprietors

(243) IS RECODED TO: 18

243 SUPERVISORS AND PROPRIETORS, SALES OCCUPATIONS (40)

Sales Representatives, Finance and Business Services

(253) THROUGH (257) ARE RECODED TO: 18

253 INSURANCE SALES OCCUPATIONS (4122)

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
(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

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

425 CROSSING GUARDS (5142)
426 GUARDS AND POLICE, EXCEPT PUBLIC SERVICE (5144)
427 PROTECTIVE SERVICE OCCUPATIONS, N.E.C. (5149)

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 AIDES, EXCEPT NURSING (5233)
447 NURSING AIDES, 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)

- 466 BAGGAGE PORTERS AND BELLHOPS (5262)
- 467 WELFARE SERVICE AIDES (5263)
- 468 CHILD CARE WORKERS, EXCEPT PRIVATE HOUSEHOLD (5264)
- 469 PERSONAL SERVICE OCCUPATIONS, N.E.C. (5258, 5269)

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
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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

553 SUPERVISORS; BRICKMASONS, STONEMASONS, AND TILE
SETTERS (6312)
554 SUPERVISORS, CARPENTERS AND RELATED WORKERS (6313)
555 SUPERVISORS, ELECTRICIANS AND POWER TRANSMISSION
INSTALLERS (6314)
556 SUPERVISORS; PAINTERS, PAPERHANGERS, AND PLASTERERS
(6315)
557 SUPERVISORS; PLUMBERS, PIPEFITTERS, AND
STEAMFITTERS (6316)
558 SUPERVISORS, N.E.C. (6311, 6318)

-construction trades, except supervisors-

(563) THROUGH (599) ARE RECODED TO: 48

563 BRICKMASONS AND STONEMASONS, (PT 6412, PT 6413)
564 BRICKMASON AND STONEMASON APPRENTICES
(PT 6412, PT 6413)
565 TILE SETTERS, HARD AND SOFT (6414, PT 6462)
566 CARPET INSTALLERS (PT 6462)
567 CARPENTERS (PT 6422)
569 CARPENTER APPRENTICES (PT 6422)
573 DRYWALL INSTALLERS (6424)
575 ELECTRICIANS (PT 6432)
576 ELECTRICIAN APPRENTICES (PT 6432)
577 ELECTRICAL POWER INSTALLERS AND REPAIRERS (6433)
579 PAINTERS, CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE (6442)
583 PAPERHANGERS (6443)
584 PLASTERERS (6444)
585 PLUMBERS, PIPEFITTERS, AND STEAMFITTERS (PT 645)
587 PLUMBER, PIPEFITTER, AND STEAMFITTER APPRENTICES
(PT 645)
588 CONCRETE AND TERRAZZO FINISHERS (6463)
589 GLAZIERS (6464)
593 INSULATION WORKERS (6465)
594 PAVING, SURFACING, AND TAMPING EQUIPMENT OPERATORS
(6466)
595 ROOFERS (6468)
596 SHEETMETAL DUCT INSTALLERS (6472)
597 STRUCTURAL METAL WORKERS (6473)
598 DRILLERS, EARTH (6474)
599 CONSTRUCTION TRADES, N.E.C. (6467, 6475, 6476,
6479)

Extractive Occupations

(613) THROUGH (617) ARE RECODED TO: 49

613 SUPERVISORS, EXTRACTIVE OCCUPATIONS (632)
614 DRILLERS, OIL WELL (652)
615 EXPLOSIVES WORKERS (653)
616 MINING MACHINE OPERATORS (654)
617 MINING OCCUPATIONS, N.E.C. (656)

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
Precision Production Occupations

.....
-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

675 AND MOLDERS AND SHAPERS, EXCEPT JEWELERS (6861)
676 PATTERNMAKERS, LAY-OUT WORKERS, AND CUTTERS (6862)
677 OPTICAL GOODS WORKERS (6864, PT 7477, PT 7677)
678 DENTAL LABORATORY AND MEDICAL APPLIANCE TECHNICIANS
(6865)
679 BOOKBINDERS (6844)
683 ELECTRICAL AND ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT ASSEMBLERS
(6867)
684 MISCELLANEOUS PRECISION WORKERS, N.E.C. (6869)

-precision food production occupations-

(686) THROUGH (688) ARE RECODED TO: 54

686 BUTCHERS AND MEAT CUTTERS (6871)
687 BAKERS (6872)
688 FOOD BATCHMAKERS (6873, 6879)

-precision inspectors, testers and related workers-

(689) THROUGH (693) ARE RECODED TO: 55

689 INSPECTORS, TESTERS, AND GRADERS (6881, 828)
693 ADJUSTERS AND CALIBRATORS (6882)

Plant and System Operators

(694) THROUGH (699) ARE RECODED TO: 56

694 WATER AND SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT OPERATORS (691)
695 POWER PLANT OPERATORS (PT 693)
696 STATIONARY ENGINEERS (PT 693, 7668)
699 MISCELLANEOUS PLANT AND SYSTEM OPERATORS (692, 694,
695, 696)

OPERATORS, FABRICATORS, AND LABORERS

Machine Operators, Assemblers, and Inspectors

.....

-machine operators and tenders, except precision:
metalworking and plastic working machine operators-

(703) THROUGH (717) ARE RECODED TO: 57

703 LATHE AND TURNING MACHINE SET-UP OPERATORS (7312)
704 LATHE AND TURNING MACHINE OPERATORS (7512)
705 MILLING AND PLANING MACHINE OPERATORS (7313, 7513)
706 PUNCHING AND STAMPING PRESS MACHINE OPERATORS
(7314, 7317, 7514, 7517)
707 ROLLING MACHINE OPERATORS (7316, 7516)
708 DRILLING AND BORING MACHINE OPERATORS (7318, 7518)
709 GRINDING, ABRADING, BUFFING, AND POLISHING MACHINE
OPERATORS (7322, 7324, 7522)
713 FORGING MACHINE OPERATORS (7319, 7519)

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

714 NUMERICAL CONTROL MACHINE OPERATORS (7326)
715 MISCELLANEOUS METAL, PLASTIC, STONE, AND GLASS
WORKING MACHINE OPERATORS (7329, 7529)
717 FABRICATING MACHINE OPERATORS, N.E.C. (7339, 7539)

-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)

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
749 MISCELLANEOUS TEXTILE MACHINE OPERATORS
(7459, 7659)

-machine operators and tenders, except precision:
machine operators, assorted materials-

(753) THROUGH (779) ARE RECODED TO: 62

753 CEMENTING AND GLUING MACHINE OPERATORS (7661)
754 PACKAGING AND FILLING MACHINE OPERATORS
(7462, 7662)
755 EXTRUDING AND FORMING MACHINE OPERATORS
(7463, 7663)
756 MIXING AND BLENDING MACHINE OPERATORS (7664)
757 SEPARATING, FILTERING, AND CLARIFYING MACHINE
OPERATORS (7476, 7666, 7676)
758 COMPRESSING AND COMPACTING MACHINE OPERATORS
(7467, 7667)
759 PAINTING AND PAINT SPRAYING MACHINE OPERATORS
(7669)
763 ROASTING AND BAKING MACHINE OPERATORS, FOOD
(7472, 7672)
764 WASHING, CLEANING, AND PICKLING MACHINE OPERATORS
(7673)
765 FOLDING MACHINE OPERATORS (7474, 7674)
766 FURNACE, KILN, AND OVEN OPERATORS, EXC. FOOD (7675)
768 CRUSHING AND GRINDING MACHINE OPERATORS
(PT 7477, PT 7677)
769 SLICING AND CUTTING MACHINE OPERATORS (7478, 7678)
773 MOTION PICTURE PROJECTIONISTS (PT 7479)
774 PHOTOGRAPHIC PROCESS MACHINE OPERATORS
(6863, 6868, 7671)
777 MISCELLANEOUS MACHINE OPERATORS, N.E.C.
(PT 7479, 7665, 7679)
779 MACHINE OPERATORS, NOT SPECIFIED

-fabricators, assemblers, and hand working occupations-

(783) THROUGH (795) ARE RECODED TO: 63

783 WELDERS AND CUTTERS (7332, 7532, 7714)
784 SOLDERERS AND BRAZERS (7333, 7533, 7717)
785 ASSEMBLERS (772, 774)
786 HAND CUTTING AND TRIMMING OCCUPATIONS (7753)
787 HAND MOLDING, CASTING, AND FORMING OCCUPATIONS
(7754, 7755)
789 HAND PAINTING, COATING, AND DECORATING OCCUPATIONS
(7756)
793 HAND ENGRAVING AND PRINTING OCCUPATIONS (7757)
794 HAND GRINDING AND POLISHING OCCUPATIONS (7758)
795 MISCELLANEOUS HAND WORKING OCCUPATIONS (7759)

-production inspectors, testers, samplers, and weighers-

(796) THROUGH (799) ARE RECODED TO: 64

- 796 PRODUCTION INSPECTORS, CHECKERS, AND EXAMINERS
(782, 787)
- 797 PRODUCTION TESTERS (783)
- 798 PRODUCTION SAMPLERS AND WEIGHERS (784)
- 799 GRADERS AND SORTERS, EXCEPT AGRICULTURAL (785)

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)

Transportation Occupations, except Motor Vehicles

.....
-rail transportation occupations-

(823) THROUGH (826) ARE RECODED TO: 66

- 823 RAILROAD CONDUCTORS AND YARDMASTERS (8113)
- 809 TAXICAB DRIVERS AND CHAUFFEURS (8216)
- 813 PARKING LOT ATTENDANTS (874)
- 814 MOTOR TRANSPORTATION OCCUPATIONS, N.E.C. (8219)

Transportation Occupations, except Motor Vehicles

.....
-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)

Material Moving Equipment Operators

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

(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)

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
150 MISCELLANEOUS TEXTILE MILL PRODUCTS (229)

NONDURABLE GOODS: APPAREL AND OTHER FINISHED TEXTILE PRODUCTS

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

171 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)

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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)
561 FARM SUPPLIES (5191)
562 MISCELLANEOUS WHOLESALE, NONDURABLE GOODS (5194,
5198, 5199)
571 NOT SPECIFIED WHOLESALE TRADE

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)

691 anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
NOT SPECIFIED RETAIL TRADE

FINANCE, INSURANCE, AND REAL ESTATE

700 BANKING (60)
701 SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS (612)
702 CREDIT AGENCIES, N.E.C. (61, EXCEPT 612)
710 SECURITY, COMMODITY BROKERAGE, AND INVESTMENT
COMPANIES (62, 67)
711 INSURANCE (63, 64)
712 REAL ESTATE, INCLUDING REAL ESTATE-INSURANCE-LAW
OFFICES (65, 66)

BUSINESS AND REPAIR SERVICES

721 ADVERTISING (731)
722 SERVICES TO DWELLINGS AND OTHER BUILDINGS (734)
730 COMMERCIAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND TESTING
LABS (7391, 7397)
731 PERSONNEL SUPPLY SERVICES (736)
732 BUSINESS MANAGEMENT AND CONSULTING SERVICES (7392)
740 COMPUTER AND DATA PROCESSING SERVICES (737)
741 DETECTIVE AND PROTECTIVE SERVICES (7393)
742 BUSINESS SERVICES, N.E.C. (732, 733, 735, 7394,
7395, 7396, 7399)
750 AUTOMOTIVE SERVICES, EXCEPT REPAIR (751, 752, 754)
751 AUTOMOTIVE REPAIR SHOPS (753)
752 ELECTRICAL REPAIR SHOPS (762, 7694)
760 MISCELLANEOUS REPAIR SERVICES (763, 764,
7692, 7699)

PERSONAL SERVICES

761 PRIVATE HOUSEHOLDS (88)
762 HOTELS AND MOTELS (701)
770 LODGING PLACES, EXCEPT HOTELS AND MOTELS (702,
703, 704)
771 LAUNDRY, CLEANING, AND GARMENT SERVICES (721)
772 BEAUTY SHOPS (723)
780 BARBER SHOPS (724)
781 FUNERAL SERVICE AND CREMATORIES (726)
782 SHOE REPAIR SHOPS (725)
790 DRESSMAKING SHOPS (PT 729)
791 MISCELLANEOUS PERSONAL SERVICES (722, PT 729)

ENTERTAINMENT AND RECREATION SERVICE

800 THEATERS AND MOTION PICTURES (78, 792)
801 BOWLING ALLEYS, BILLIARD AND POOL PARLORS (793)
802 MISCELLANEOUS ENTERTAINMENT AND RECREATION
SERVICES (791, 794, 799)

PROFESSIONAL AND RELATED SERVICES

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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)
882 ENGINEERING, ARCHITECTURAL, AND SURVEYING SERVICES
(891)
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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
 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
 140 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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

239 West Indies (except Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands)
or "Caribbean"--reference to two or more West
Indian countries

South America

259 South America; South American country or countries

EUROPE

British Isles

301 England

302 Ireland (NA North or South); southern Ireland

303 Scotland

304 Wales

305 Northern Ireland (Ulster)

306 Scot-Irish

308 United Kingdom; Great Britain

309 "BRITISH ISLES"; GENERAL MENTION OF AREA; REFERENCE
TO TWO OR MORE COUNTRIES OF THE BRITISH ISLES

Western Europe

310 Austria

311 Belgium

312 France

313 Federal Republic of Germany (W. Germany)

314 German Democratic Republic (E. Germany)

315 Germany--NA East or West

316 Luxembourg

317 Netherlands; Holland

318 Switzerland

319 "WESTERN EUROPE"; GENERAL MENTION OF AREA;
REFERENCE TO TWO OR MORE COUNTRIES OF WESTERN
EUROPE

320 Scandinavia

321 Denmark

322 Finland

323 Norway

324 Sweden

325 Iceland

328 GENERAL MENTION OF AREA OF WESTERN EUROPE AND/OR
SCANDINAVIA AND/OR BRITISH ISLES AND/OR
MEDITERRANEAN COUNTRIES AND/OR GREECE; REFERENCE
TO TWO OR MORE COUNTRIES IN DIFFERENT AREAS LISTED
ABOVE

329 "SCANDINAVIA"; GENERAL MENTION OF AREA; REFERENCE
TO TWO OR MORE SCANDINAVIAN COUNTRIES

Eastern Europe

331 Czechoslovakia (Slavic)

332 Estonia

333 Hungary

334 Latvia

335 Lithuania

336 Poland

337 Russia (or U.S.S.R.)

338 Ukraine

339 "EASTERN EUROPE"; GENERAL MENTION OF AREA;
REFERENCE TO TWO OR MORE COUNTRIES OF EASTERN
EUROPE

Balkan Countries

341 Albania

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

342 Bulgaria
343 Greece
344 Rumania
345 Yugoslavia
348 General mention of area; reference to two or more
Balkan Countries

349 "BALKANS"; GENERAL REFERENCE OF AREA; REFERENCE TO
COUNTRIES IN EASTERN EUROPE AND BALKAN COUNTRIES

Mediterranean Countries

351 Italy
352 Portugal
353 Spain
354 Malta or Gozo

399 "EUROPE"; GENERAL MENTION OF AREA; REFERENCE TO TWO
OR MORE COUNTRIES OF EUROPE IN DIFFERENT AREAS

ASIA except Near East

401 Afghanistan
404 India
405 1990: Pakistan
406 Pakistan
428 Southeast Asia: Indochina, Thailand, Malaya,
Burma, Philippines, Indonesia; Hong Kong
431 China (mainland)
432 1990: Taiwan, Formosa
434 Taiwan, Formosa
451 Japan
452 Korea (North or South)
499 "ASIA"; GENERAL MENTION OF AREA; REFERENCE TO TWO
OR MORE COUNTRIES OF ASIA

NEAR EAST

501 U.A.R. (Egypt)
502 Iran
503 Iraq
504 Israel (or Palestine)
505 Jordan
506 Lebanon
507 Saudi Arabia
508 Syria
509 Turkey
599 "NEAR EAST"; "MIDDLE EAST"; GENERAL MENTION OF
AREA; REFERENCE TO TWO OR MORE COUNTRIES OF NEAR
EAST

AFRICA

655 South Africa
699 Africa; any African country or countries, excluding
only South Africa and U.A.R. (Egypt)

OCEANIA

704 Australia, New Zealand, Tasmania

OTHER:

997 Other (combinations) not codeable elsewhere
998 DK
999 NA

□>> MASTER CODE
IMPORTANT PROBLEMS CODE

SOCIAL WELFARE

001 General reference to domestic issues;

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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;

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
 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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
school

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
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)

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
 995 1990-91: "There were no issues"; "there were no
 issues, just party politics"
 996 1990-91: "There was no campaign in my district"
 997 Other specific mentions of important problems
 998 DK
 999 NA
 000 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 nationalist; 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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

-
- 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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

505 Other cautious spending responses

506 Want to CUT TAXES--NFS; want to keep taxes
low/decrease government revenues

507 Will cut INCOME TAXES; will not increase income
taxes; will rely on taxes other than income tax to
provide government revenue

512 Favor (too much) GOVERNMENT CONTROL OVER ECONOMY;
doesn't let business get more involved/handle
problems of poverty/ unemployment, etc.

412 Don't favor (too much) government control over
economy; LETS BUSINESS GET MORE INVOLVED/handle
problems of poverty/ unemployment, etc.

490 Other reference to fiscal and economic policy

435 Propose/enact FAIR TAXES; believe everyone should
be taxed the same/that taxes should be even-handed

535 Propose/enact UNFAIR TAXES; show favoritism/give
tax breaks to certain groups or types of people

436 Give tax breaks to the poor/working/middle class
people; tax policies favor the lower/middle
classes

536 Give tax breaks to the wealthy/corporations; tax
policies favor the rich/powerful/upper classes

SPECIFIC DOMESTIC POLICIES FAVORED BY LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE

600 MINIMUM WAGE LEGISLATION; favors raising minimum
wage, or favors raising unemployment compensation

601 SOCIAL SECURITY, government pension rates

603 FULL EMPLOYMENT policies; government commitment
to provide a job for everyone who wants to work

610 MEDICAL (HEALTH) INSURANCE, medical care for the
aged, socialized medicine, Medicare

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 federal control of education or schools
response

633 Prayer in schools

640 CIVIL RIGHTS, insist more strongly on civil rights

641 Law and order--hard line (or NA line); want 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.

673 Food stamps

674 Provides for/support/spend (more) for child care
or parental leave policy; license/fund day care
facilities

680 FARM policy

681 ABORTION; birth control

682 Women's rights; ERA

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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"

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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,

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

- 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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

66 Afghan
67 Indian (not American Indian, code 01)
68 Southeast Asia--from Indochina, Thailand, Malaya,
Burma, Philippines, Indonesia
69 Chinese
70 Japanese; Japanese American
71 Korean
NEAR EAST
73 Egyptian
74 Iranian, Persian
75 Iraqi
76 Israeli
77 Jordanian
78 Lebanese
79 Arab, Arabian, Saudi Arabian
80 Syrian
81 Turk, Turkish
82 Armenian
AFRICA
83 African; from any African country excluding only
Egypt (U.A.R.); South African (formerly 90)
OCEANIA
85 Australian, New Zealander, Tasmanian
ETHNIC GROUPS
86 White, Caucasian
87 Black; Negro; American Black; African American
88 Chicano; Mexican-American; Hispanic; Latin American
OTHER, MISCELLANEOUS
90 NEITHER
91 Catholic
92 Protestant
93 Jewish
94 Mormon
95 Other religious groups
97 Other group; combinations not codeable above
98 DK
99 NA

□>> MASTER CODE
PARTY-CANDIDATE

PARTY ONLY -- PEOPLE WITHIN PARTY

0001 Johnson
0002 Kennedy, John; JFK
0003 Kennedy, Robert; RFK
0004 Kennedy, Edward; "Ted"
0005 Kennedy, NA which
0006 Truman
0007 Roosevelt; "FDR"
0008 McGovern
0009 Carter
0010 Mondale
0011 McCarthy, Eugene
0012 Humphrey
0013 Muskie
0014 Dukakis, Michael
0015 Wallace
0016 Jackson, Jesse
0017 Clinton, Bill
0018 Clinton, Hillary

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

the ground
0224 Has fulfilled/Sept (campaign) promises
0225 Has not fulfilled/Sept (campaign) promises
0297 Other candidate experience/ability reasons

CANDIDATE ONLY -- CANDIDATE LEADERSHIP QUALITIES

0301 Dignified/has dignity
0302 Undignified/lacks dignity
0303 Strong/decisive/self-confident/aggressive; will end all this indecision
0304 Weak/indecisive/lacks self-confidence/vacillating
0305 Inspiring; a man you can follow; "a leader"
0306 Uninspiring; not a man you can follow; not a leader
*0335 Makes people feel good about America/being Americans; is patriotic/loves the country
0307 People have confidence in him
0308 People don't have confidence in him
0309 Good at communicating with blacks, young people, other "problem" groups
0310 Bad at communicating with blacks, young people, other "problem" groups (if communicate in general, see 0441, 0442)
0311 Knows how to handle people (at personal level)
0312 Doesn't know how to handle people (at personal level)
0313 A politician/political person; (too) much in politics; a good politician; part of Washington crowd; politically motivated; just wants to be re-elected
0314 Not a politician; not in politics; above politics; a bad politician
0315 Independent; no one runs him; his own boss
0316 Not independent; run by others; not his own man/boss
0317 Humble; knows his limitations; doesn't pretend to know all the answers
0318 Not humble enough; too cocky/self-confident; can't admit shortcomings; blames others for his/her mistakes
0319 (Too) Careful/Cautious/Good judgment
0320 (Too) Impulsive/Careless/Bad/Poor judgment
*0334 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
0321 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
0322 Doesn't help people in the district on a personal level; was not helpful to R with a personal problem (specific mention)
0323 Represents (well) the views of the district; close to people in the district; comes home regularly to chat and mix with people
0324 Does not represent (well) the views of the district; not close to the people in the district; doesn't interact enough with the people
0325 Keeps people well informed about governmental matters; communicates with constituents; any mention of R receiving newsletters or

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
 positive sense, code 0403)

0417 Uses common sense; makes a lot of sense; pragmatic/
 practical/down-to-earth

0418 Not sensible; impractical

0419 (Too) well educated; scholarly

0420 Poorly educated; unschooled

0421 Intelligent/Smart

0422 Unintelligent/Stupid/Dumb

*0464 Uninformed; doesn't (seem to) know anything about
 the issues/what is going on in the country/
 government

0423 Religious; "moral" (in religious sense);
 God-fearing; "too" religious

0424 "Irreligious"; "immoral" (in religious sense);
 Playboy interview (reflects on Carter--1976)

0425 Self-made; not well off; started out as poor;
 worked his way up; (started out)
 unpolished/unrefined/rough

0426 Wealthy; rich; born with silver spoon in mouth;
 polished/refined/well-mannered

0427 Old hat; has run before; a die-hard; "a loser" (in
 the past)

0428 Someone new; a fresh face

0429 Don't change horses in midstream

0430 Time for a change; incumbent has been in office too
 long/long enough [code 174 for mentions of party]

0431 Unsafe/Unstable; dictatorial; craves power;
 ruthless

0432 Safe/Stable

0433 Sense of humor; jokes a lot (too much)

0434 No sense of humor; humorless (too serious)

0435 Kind/Warm/Gentle

0436 Cold/Aloof

0437 Likeable; gets along with people; friendly;
 outgoing

0438 Not likeable; can't get along with people

0439 Democratic (in non-partisan sense)

0440 Undemocratic (in non-partisan sense)

0441 High-fallutin'/High-brow; talks in circles; can't
 talk to common man; can't communicate ideas well

0442 Not high-fallutin'/is low-brow; talks straight; can
 talk to common man; can communicate ideas well

0443 Well-known; "I know him/her"

0444 Unknown; not well known

0445 Reference to his family (not 0457)

0446 Reference to his wife/spouse

0447 Speaking ability

0448 Health

0449 Appearance/Looks/Face/Appearance on TV; his smile

0450 Age (NA how perceived)

0451 (Too) Old

0452 (Too) Young

0453 Mature

0454 Immature

0455 Regional reference; "he's a Southerner"; "he's a
 Midwesterner"; he comes from the country/a rural
 area; area reference

0456 Previous occupation

0457 He's a family man

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

0459 Energetic; too energetic
0460 Not energetic
0461 Gender, e.g., "She's a woman"
0462 Racial/Ethnic attribute; "He is a black man"
*0464 Located after 0422
0495 Other negative personal qualities
0496 Other positive personal qualities
0497 Other candidate personal qualities
0498 References to Playboy interview--NA direction or neutral; "it's OK," "that is what the Bible says", (not 0401)--1976

CANDIDATE ONLY--PARTY CONNECTIONS

0500 A Democrat; good Democrat; typical Democrat
0501 A Republican; good Republican; typical Republican
0502 Controlled by party regulars/bosses/machine
0503 Not controlled by party regulars/bosses
0504 Reference to men around him/staff/followers
0505 Reference to his speeches (exc. 0447), campaign tactics; mud-slinging; (88) dislike Bush's stand on Pledge of Allegiance issue
0506 Can win; best choice for party victory
0507 Cannot win; not good choice for party victory
0508 Reference to linkage with other party figures (he's close to the Kennedy's; he was close to Eisenhower; etc.)
0509 Would continue/Seep/follow Democratic policies (unspecified)
0510 Would change/get rid of " "
0511 Would continue/Seep/follow Democratic domestic policies (unspecified, not codeable in 0900's)
0512 Would change/get rid of " " "
0513 Would continue/Seep/follow Democratic foreign policies (unspecified, not codeable in 1100's)
0514 Would change/get rid of " " "
0515 Would continue/Seep/follow Republican policies (unspecified)
0516 Would change/get rid of " "
0517 Would continue/Seep/follow Republican domestic policies (unspecified, not codeable in 0900's)
0518 Would change/get rid of " " "
0519 Would continue/Seep/follow Republican foreign policies (unspecified, not codeable in 1100's)
0520 Would change/get rid of " " "
0531 More liberal than most Democrats; a Northern Democrat
0532 More conservative " " ; a Southern Democrat
0533 More liberal than most Republicans; an Eastern Republican
0534 More conservative " " ; a Midwestern/Western/ Southern Republican
0535 Will bring in/listen to the (party) liberals
0536 Will bring in/listen to the (party) conservatives
0541 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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
 (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
 0697 Other government management reasons
 0628 [1994] Contract with America that was proposed by
 Republicans; support/commitment/opposition to
 with America

Contract

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

0710 Bad for country (unspecified); don't have country's interests at heart; only looking out for their own interests

0711 Lesser of two evils

0718 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

0719 References to damaging incidents in candidate's personal life (sexual escapades, financial problems, substance abuse, etc); [1980] Reference to Chappaquidic; Kennedy's personal problems

0720 Reference to Watergate affair (exc. 0551-0554)

0721 The way the incumbent came to office; the people should select President

0722 The incumbent should have a chance (on his own)/another chance/second chance

0723 (I believe in/Necessary for) a two-party system; choice between candidates; opposition; balances power of other party

0724 Vote for the man rather than party; look for more qualified man; don't pay attention to parties

0725 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

0726 Splits votes; will elect wrong candidate; "spoiler"

0727 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)

0728 Negative comments about the candidate's switching parties, being a turncoat, disloyal to his original party

0729 Party selection of a woman for vice-president

0730 Mention of debates; candidate's performance in the debates

0731 Position (vote) on increasing congressional salary; position (vote) on accepting honoraria/outside pay/royalties while in office

*0732 Located after 0702

0733 References to candidate's children or extended family [code 446 for references to spouse]

0796 References to unfair/undeserved/excessive criticism by media or public

0797 Other miscellaneous reasons: Other miscellaneous reasons relating to image and candidate/party effect on nation

PARTY OR CANDIDATE--GOVERNMENT ACTIVITY/PHILOSOPHY

0801 General assessment of ideas/policies/stands (unspecified)

0802 Different from other party/candidate

0803 Same as other party/candidate; not different enough

0804 (Too) negative; always tearing down other side; no solutions of his/their own

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

0805 For government activity; believe government should take care of things; for big government; supports social programs/ spending (not 0905-0907)

0806 Against government activity; believe government involved in too many things; favors reduction in social programs/ spending (not 0905-0907)

0807 Humanistic; favor human beings over property rights

0808 Not humanistic; favor property rights over human beings

0809 Favor social change/reform/progress/improvement of social conditions

0810 Against social change/reform/progress/improvement of social conditions

0811 Socialistic

0812 Anti-socialistic

0813 Communistic/soft/hard-liner on Communism/apologist for Communists/dupe

0814 (Too) anti-communistic/hard-liner on Communism

0815 (Too) liberal (except 0531 or 0533)

0816 (Too) conservative (except 0532 or 0534)

0817 Moderate/middle of the road/for slow change; not an extremist/fanatic

0818 Extremist/fanatic/too far out; not too moderate/not a fence-sitter

0819 Pro-Far Right/Birchers/reactionaries; encouraging fascist/ police state

0820 Anti-Far Right/ " " ; discouraging "

0821 Pro-Far Left/radicals/Yippies/SDS; encouraging anarchy/ guerilla state

0822 Anti-Far Left/ " " " ; discouraging "

0823 Pro-Extremists (NA direction)/nuts/bomb-throwers

0824 Anti-Extremists " " "

0827 Pro-States'/local/community rights; better local government

0828 Anti- " " " " ; worse/weaker local government

0829 For equality; believe everyone should have things equally/ be treated equally

0830 Anti-equality; believe some people should have more than others/people should not be treated equally

0831 Generous, compassionate, believe in helping others

0832 Selfish, only help themselves

0833 Acceptance of change/new ideas; less bound to status quo; more open to new ideas/ways of doing things; flexible, innovative

0834 Resistance to change/new ideas; stick to (protect) status quo; resist new ways of doing things; rigid

0835 Has a well-defined set of beliefs/definite philosophy; does not compromise on principles; has (clear) understanding of goals they stand for

0836 Has poorly defined set of beliefs; lacks a definite philosophy; compromise on principles; has no (clear) understanding of goals they stand for

0837 Favor work ethic; believes in self-reliance/in people working hard to get ahead

0838 Doesn't favor work ethic; believes in people being handed things/in government handouts (if specific policy mentioned, code in 0900's)

0841 Keep track of/control over administration heads,

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
 cabinet members, etc.; follow through on policies;
 determine if programs are working
 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)
 0897 Other Government Activity/Philosophy reasons

NA)

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

```

*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

```

```

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
*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

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
        energy source, worse/handled worse;
        less fuel
*****
References to nuclear energy should be coded in 0959.
*****
1007 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

```

gun"

```

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
1014 " " " --Pro
1015 " " " --Anti
1016 Influx of political/economic refugees (Cubans,
Haitians, Mexicans, etc.) --NA direction
1017 " " " --Pro
1018 " " " --Anti
1019 School prayer--NA direction
1020 " " --Pro
1021 " " --Anti
1022 Gay rights--NA direction
1023 " " --Pro
1024 " " --Anti
1025 Health--NA direction: [1994](Clinton's) National
health care plan/program
1026 " --Pro government programs/aid for mentally ill,
disabled, handicapped: [1994] (Clinton's) National
health care plan/program
1027 " --Anti " " " " " "
(except 0923, 0924, 0925): [1994](Clinton's) National
health care plan/program
1028 Space program--NA direction
1029 " " --Pro
1030 " " --Anti
1031 Help to/improvement in a specific industry or
occupation--NA direction
1032 " " " " " -- Pro help/improvement
1033 " " " " " -- Anti help/improvement
*1057 Spending on infrastructure (roads, bridges, etc)
-- Pro
*1058 " " " " " -- Anti
1035 Polarization of classes/increasing gap between
rich and poor--NA direction
1036 " " " " " --will stop trend/
handle better
1037 " " " " " --will accelerate trend/
handle better
1038 Day care--NA direction
1039 " " --favors/will expand or extend day care
programs
1040 " " --opposes/will not expand or extend (will
cut or eliminate) day care programs
*1050 Family/maternity leave laws -- Pro
*1051 " " " " " -- Anti
1041 Located after 0973
*1042 Located after 0978
*1043 Located after 0948
*1044 Located after 0948
*1045 Located after 0948
*1046 Located after 0928
*1047 Located after 0919
*1048 Located after 0919
*1049 Located after 0919
*1050 Located after 1040
*1051 Located after 1040
*1052 Located after 0919
*1053 Located after 0919
*1054 Located after 0928
*1055 Located after 0933
*1056 Located after 0933

```

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

*1057 Located after 1033
*1058 Located after 1033
*1059 Located after 0961
*1060 Located after 0961

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

*1184 Military/Defense position/spending--NA direction or
neutral (not 1106, 1107)

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

```

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
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 " " "
*1301 Western Europe -- NA direction
*1302 " " -- handling relations with European
Community/specific countries well (better)
*1303 " " " " badly (worse)
1138 Latin America--NA direction
1139 " " --handle better/more experience
1140 " " --handle worse/less experience
1141 " " --pro-third world posture; reach
understanding with Castro/Chile/neutrals;
anti-colonialism /European powers; against Contra
aid/pro- Sandinista
1142 " " --anti-third world posture; hard
anti-communism/anti-revolutionary policy;
pro-colonialism/ European powers; pro Contra
aid/anti-Sandinista
*1198 (Involvement in) Diversion of money to the Contras
(in violation of the law)
1143 Africa--NA direction
1144 " --handle better/more experience
1145 " --handle worse/less experience
1146 " --pro-third world posture; reach understanding
with leftists/neutrals; anti-colonialism/ European
powers
1147 " --anti-third world posture; hard
anti-communism/anti-revolutionary policy; pro-
colonialism/European powers
1148 Asia/India--NA direction
1149 " " --handle better/more experience
1150 " " --handle worse/less experience
1151 " " --pro India/Bangladesh
1152 " " --pro Pakistan
1153 Located after 1163
1154 " " "
1155 " " "
1156 " " "
1157 Vietnam/Indochina/Southeast Asia--NA direction
1158 " " " " --better chance for peace
1159 " " " " --poorer chance for peace;
failed to end war
1160 " " " " --pro military victory/
preservation of Saigon regime
1161 " " " " --anti military victory/
willing to sacrifice Thieu/Sy; favoring withdrawal
1163 " " --will bring policy change
(unspecified)
*1116 Trouble spots (not specifically coded)--would
handle better (Panama, Afghanistan, Persian Gulf)
*1117 " " " " " --would handle worse

```


anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
(Panama, Afghanistan, Persian Gulf)

*1162 (88) The invasion of Grenada
*1300 (91) The Persian Gulf war/ Desert Storm
*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
1175 POW-MIA--Will get prisoners back, will not abandon
them
1176 POW-MIA--Will not get prisoners back, will abandon
them
1177 POW-MIA--NA direction
*1178 Located after 1174
1179 Did a good job of getting the boys/country out of
Vietnam war; got us out of Vietnam
1180 Should have won Vietnam war; gave too much away and
then pulled out
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)

```

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
Bombing of Libya
1194 " " " -- has handled/would handle
better; (88) Bombing of Libya/handling of Khadafy
1195 " " " -- 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

```

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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:

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

300 Divisive (sets class against class, caters to special interests (NA what), plays group politics, not for all the people; (Dems/Reps) 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 not specified

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

DOMESTIC POLICY REFERENCES

- FISCAL POLICY--EASY SPENDING RESPONSES

400 SPEND MORE FREELY/high spenders (NFS)

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; DEFICIT SPENDING

403 Spend under special circumstances, such as hard times

404 Bring cheap money; more money circulating

405 Other easy spending response

406 RAISE TAXES--NFS; keep taxes high; seek to increase government revenues

407 Increase INCOME TAXES; will not cut income taxes; rely on increase in/high income tax to provide government revenues

- FISCAL POLICY--CAUTIOUS SPENDING RESPONSES

500 SPEND LESS FREELY; economy in government (NFS)

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

505 Other cautious spending response

506 CUT TAXES--NFS; keep taxes low; seek to decrease government revenues

507 Cut INCOME TAXES; will not increase income taxes; rely on taxes other than income tax to provide

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
government revenue

- 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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
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;

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

socialized medicine; medicare

617 HOUSING; aid to the homeless

625 Government CONTROL OF UTILITIES; CONSERVATION;
public works; ecology, environment

635 Federal AID TO EDUCATION; school choice plans

636 BUSSING; forced integration

637 Other federal control of education or schools
response

639 Gun control

645 CIVIL RIGHTS (legislation)

646 LAW AND ORDER--HARD LINE (or NA line); death
penalty (88)

647 LAW AND ORDER--SOFT LINE; death penalty (88)

648 PROPERTY RIGHTS; open housing

649 Policies which would DIVIDE COUNTRY; have civil
war; race war

655 Higher TARIFFS; free trade

665 Prohibition; "dry"/"wet" legislation

675 General mention of SOCIAL WELFARE; "give away
programs"

676 POVERTY program

677 EMPLOYMENT (JOB) TRAINING programs, Job Corps, etc.

685 FARM policy

686 ABORTION

687 Women's rights; ERA

688 Legalization of marijuana; lenient drug laws

689 Homosexual/GAY RIGHTS

695 Domestic issues difference, but NA which
- SPECIFIC DOMESTIC POLICIES OPPOSED BY PARTY

700 MINIMUM WAGE or UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION; won't
raise minimum wage, won't improve unemployment
compensation

701 SOCIAL SECURITY; against raising benefits

710 MEDICAL (HEALTH) INSURANCE; against medical card
for aged; against socialized medicine, medicare

712 HOUSING; aid to the homeless

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 BUSSING; forced integration

732 OTHER FEDERAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION or schools
response; school choice plans

734 Gun control

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/prevention of crime, etc.; police
state; imposing the death penalty (88)

742 Following a SOFT LINE IN MAINTENANCE OF LAW AND
ORDER/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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
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
-----------	-------------

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

-----	-----
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown	Patrick J. Buchanan
Bill Clinton	George Bush
Paul E. Tsongas	H. Ross Perot (write-in)
H. Ross Perot (write-in)	
Unc/Other	

BALLOT CARD FOR COLORADO
Candidates for the March 3rd Primary

Democrats	Republicans
-----	-----
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr.	Patrick J. Buchanan
Bill Clinton	George Bush
Tom Harkin	Other
Bob Kerry	
Paul E. Tsongas	
Others/Unc	

BALLOT CARD FOR CONNECTICUT
Candidates for the March 24th Primary

Democrats	Republicans
-----	-----
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr.	Patrick J. Buchanan
Bill Clinton	George Bush
Paul E. Tsongas	David Duke
Other	Uncommitted
Uncommitted	

BALLOT CARD FOR FLORIDA
Candidates for the March 10th Primary

Democrats	Republicans
-----	-----
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr.	George Bush
Bill Clinton	Patrick J. Buchanan
Tom Harkin	
Paul E. Tsongas	
Other	

BALLOT CARD FOR GEORGIA
Candidates for the March 3rd Primary

Democrats	Republicans
-----	-----
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr.	Patrick J. Buchanan
Bill Clinton	George Bush
Tom Harkin	
Bob Kerry	
Paul E. Tsongas	
Uncommitted	

BALLOT CARD FOR ILLINOIS
Candidates for the March 17th Primary

Democrats	Republicans
-----	-----
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr.	Patrick J. Buchanan
Bill Clinton	George Bush
Paul E. Tsongas	Others
Uncommitted	
Others	

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

BALLOT CARD FOR INDIANA

Candidates for the May 5th Primary

Democrats	Republicans
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr.	Patrick J. Buchanan
Bill Clinton	George Bush
Bob Kerrey	
Paul E. Tsongas	

BALLOT CARD FOR IOWA

Candidates for the February 10th Caucus

Democrats	Republicans
Edmund G. Brown Jr.	George Bush
Bill Clinton	Uncommitted
Tom Harkin	
Bob Kerrey	
Paul E. Tsongas	
Others	
Uncommitted	

BALLOT CARD FOR KANSAS

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
Others	Others
Uncommitted	Uncommitted

BALLOT CARD FOR KENTUCKY

Candidates for the May 26th Primary

Democrats	Republicans
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr.	George Bush
Bill Clinton	Uncommitted
Paul E. Tsongas	H. Ross Perot (write-in)
H. Ross Perot (write-in)	
Others	
Uncommitted	

BALLOT CARD FOR LOUISIANA

Candidates for the March 10th Primary

Democrats	Republicans
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr.	Pat Buchanan
Bill Clinton	George Bush
Tom Harkin	David Duke
Paul E. Tsongas	Other
Other	

BALLOT CARD FOR MARYLAND

Candidates for the March 3rd Primary

Democrats	Republicans
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr.	Patrick J. Buchanan
Bill Clinton	George Bush

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt
Tom Harkin
Bob Kerry
Paul E. Tsongas
Others

BALLOT CARD FOR MASSACHUSETTS
Candidates for the March 10th Primary

Democrats	Republicans
-----	-----
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr.	Pat Buchanan
Bill Clinton	George Bush
Tom Harkin	David Duke
Paul E. Tsongas	Other
Other	Uncommitted
Uncommitted	

BALLOT CARD FOR MICHIGAN
Candidates for the March 17th Primary

Democrats	Republicans
-----	-----
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr.	Patrick J. Buchanan
Bill Clinton	George Bush
Tom Harkin	David Duke
Bob Kerry	Uncommitted
Paul E. Tsongas	
Uncommitted	

BALLOT CARD FOR MINNESOTA
Candidates for the April 7th Primary

Democrats	Republicans
-----	-----
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr.	Patrick J. Buchanan
Bill Clinton	George Bush
Paul E. Tsongas	Harold E. Stassen
Uncommitted/Others	Uncommitted/Others

BALLOT CARD FOR MISSOURI
March 10th Caucus April 14th Caucus

Democrats	Republicans
-----	-----
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr.	George Bush
Bill Clinton	Pat Buchanan
Paul E. Tsongas	Uncommitted
Uncommitted	

BALLOT CARD FOR NEBRASKA
Candidates for the May 12th Primary

Democrats	Republicans
-----	-----
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown, Jr.	Patrick J. Buchanan
Bill Clinton	George Bush
Paul E. Tsongas	David Duke
H. Ross Perot (write-in)	H. Ross Perot (write-in)
Other	Other
Uncommitted	

BALLOT CARD FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE
Candidates for the February 18th Primary

Democrats	Republicans
-----------	-------------

-----	-----
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)	
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 -----	Republicans -----
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr.	Patrick J. Buchanan
Bill Clinton	George Bush
Paul E. Tsongas	David Duke
H. Ross Perot (write-in)	H. Ross Perot (write-in)
Others	

BALLOT CARD FOR PENNSYLVANIA

Democrats: April 28th Primary Reps: April 28th Caucus

-----	-----
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr.	Patrick J. Buchanan
Bill Clinton	George Bush
Paul E. Tsongas	
Others	

BALLOT CARD FOR TENNESSEE

Candidates for the March 10th Primary

Democrats -----	Republicans -----
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr.	Pat Buchanan
Bill Clinton	George Bush
Tom Harkin	David Duke
Paul E. Tsongas	Uncommitted
Other	
Uncommitted	

BALLOT CARD FOR TEXAS

Candidates for the March 10th Primary

Democrats -----	Republicans -----
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr.	Pat Buchanan
Bill Clinton	George Bush
Tom Harkin	David Duke
Paul E. Tsongas	Other
Other	

BALLOT CARD FOR VIRGINIA

Democrats: Apr. 11, 13 Caucuses Republicans: No Caucus

Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr.
Bill Clinton
Uncommitted

BALLOT CARD FOR WASHINGTON

Candidates for the May 19th Primary

Democrats -----	Republicans -----
Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr.	Patrick J. Buchanan
Bill Clinton	George Bush
Paul E. Tsongas	David Duke
H. Ross Perot (write-in)	Steven Michael
Others	H. Ross Perot (write-in)

BALLOT CARD FOR WEST VIRGINIA

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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	

BALLOT CARD FOR WISCONSIN

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	

BALLOT CARD FOR WYOMING

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

52 Democratic incumbent not running -- REPUBLICAN
CANDIDATE UNOPPOSED
53 Democratic incumbent not running -- OTHER
CANDIDATE UNOPPOSED
55 Democratic incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC AND
REPUBLICAN CANDIDATES
56 Democratic incumbent not running -- REPUBLICAN AND
OTHER CANDIDATES
57 Democratic incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC AND
OTHER CANDIDATES
59 Democratic incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC AND
REPUBLICAN AND OTHER CANDIDATES
61 Republican incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC
CANDIDATE UNOPPOSED
62 Republican incumbent not running -- REPUBLICAN
CANDIDATE UNOPPOSED
63 Republican incumbent not running -- OTHER
CANDIDATE UNOPPOSED
65 Republican incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC AND
REPUBLICAN CANDIDATES
66 Republican incumbent not running -- REPUBLICAN AND
OTHER CANDIDATES
67 Republican incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC AND
OTHER CANDIDATES
69 Republican incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC AND
REPUBLICAN AND OTHER CANDIDATES
71 Other incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC
CANDIDATE UNOPPOSED
72 Other incumbent not running -- REPUBLICAN
CANDIDATE UNOPPOSED
73 Other incumbent not running -- OTHER CANDIDATE
UNOPPOSED
75 Other incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC AND
REPUBLICAN CANDIDATES
76 Other incumbent not running -- REPUBLICAN AND
OTHER CANDIDATES
77 Other incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC AND
OTHER CANDIDATES
79 Other incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC AND
REPUBLICAN AND OTHER CANDIDATES

SENATE

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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
52 Democratic incumbent not running -- REPUBLICAN
CANDIDATE UNOPPOSED
53 Democratic incumbent not running -- OTHER
CANDIDATE UNOPPOSED
55 Democratic incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC AND
REPUBLICAN CANDIDATES
56 Democratic incumbent not running -- REPUBLICAN AND
OTHER CANDIDATES
57 Democratic incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC AND
OTHER CANDIDATES
59 Democratic incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC AND
REPUBLICAN AND OTHER CANDIDATES
61 Republican incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC
CANDIDATE UNOPPOSED
62 Republican incumbent not running -- REPUBLICAN
CANDIDATE UNOPPOSED
63 Republican incumbent not running -- OTHER
CANDIDATE UNOPPOSED
65 Republican incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC AND
REPUBLICAN CANDIDATES
66 Republican incumbent not running -- REPUBLICAN AND
OTHER CANDIDATES
67 Republican incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC AND
OTHER CANDIDATES
69 Republican incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC AND
REPUBLICAN AND OTHER CANDIDATES
71 Other incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC
CANDIDATE UNOPPOSED
72 Other incumbent not running -- REPUBLICAN
CANDIDATE UNOPPOSED
73 Other incumbent not running -- OTHER CANDIDATE
UNOPPOSED
75 Other incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC AND
REPUBLICAN CANDIDATES
76 Other incumbent not running -- REPUBLICAN AND
OTHER CANDIDATES
77 Other incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC AND
OTHER CANDIDATES
79 Other incumbent not running -- DEMOCRATIC AND
REPUBLICAN AND OTHER CANDIDATES

NO RACE IN STATE

81 DEMOCRATIC INCUMBENTS, no race in state
82 REPUBLICAN INCUMBENTS, no race in state
85 DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN INCUMBENTS, no race in
state

□>> 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.

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

- 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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

0206 4 Tuscon
0207 6 Yuma

ARKANSAS (142)

0300 6 Blytheville
0301 6 El Dorado
0302 6 Fayetteville
0303 5 Fort Smith
0304 6 Hot Springs
0310 6 Jacksonville *
0305 6 Jonesboro
0306 5 Little Rock
0307 5 North Little Rock
0308 5 Pine Bluff
0309 5 West Memphis

CALIFORNIA (171)

0400 2 Alameda
0401 2 Alhambra
0402 2 Altadena
0403 2 Anaheim
0404 2 Antioch
0405 2 Arcadia
0406 5 Arden-Arcade
0407 2 Azusa
0408 5 Bakersfield
0409 2 Baldwin Park
0557 2 Bell *
0410 2 Bellflower
0411 2 Bell Gardens
0412 2 Belmont
0413 2 Berkeley
0414 2 Beverly Hills
0558 2 Brea *
0415 2 Buena Park
0416 2 Burbank
0417 2 Burlingame
0559 6 Camarillo *
0418 2 Campbell
0560 2 Carlsbad *
0419 6 Carmichael
0420 2 Carson
0421 2 Castro Valley
0561 2 Cerritos *
0562 6 Chico *
0563 2 Chino *
0422 2 Chula Vista
0564 6 Citrus Heights *
0423 2 Claremont
0565 6 Clovis *
0424 2 Compton
0425 2 Concord
0426 2 Corona
0427 2 Costa Messa
0428 2 Covina
0429 2 Culver City
0566 2 Cupertino *
0430 2 Cypress
0431 2 Daly City

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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	Lodi
0465	6	Lompoc
0466	4	Long Beach
0467	2	Los Altos
0468	1	Los Angeles
0469	2	Los Gatos
0470	2	Lynwood
0471	2	Manhattan 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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

0702	5	Danbury
0703	5	East Hartford
0704	6	East Haven
0705	6	Enfield
0706	5	Fairfield
0707	5	Greenwich
0708	6	Groton
0709	6	Hamden
0710	5	Hartford
0711	6	Manchester
0712	5	Meriden
0713	6	Middletown
0714	5	Milford
0734	6	Naugatuck *
0715	5	New Britain
0716	5	New Haven
0717	6	Newington
0718	6	New London
0719	5	Norwalk
0720	6	Norwich
0721	6	Shelton
0722	6	Southington
0723	5	Stamford
0724	6	Stratford
0725	6	Torrington
0726	6	Trumbull
0727	6	Vernon
0728	6	Wallingford
0729	5	Waterbury
0730	5	West Hartford
0731	5	West Haven
0732	6	Westport
0733	6	Wethersfield
0735	6	Windsor *
DELAWARE	(111)	
0801	6	Newark *
0800	5	Wilmington
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	(155)	
0900	4	Washington
FLORIDA	(143)	
1000	6	Boca Raton
1032	6	Boynton Beach *
1033	6	Bradenton *
1034	6	Cape Coral *
1001	2	Carol City
1002	2	Clearwater
1003	2	Coral Gables
1035	6	Coral Springs *
1004	6	Daytona Beach
1036	6	Deerfield Beach *
1037	6	Delray Beach *
1038	2	Dunedin *
1005	5	Fort Lauderdale
1007	6	Fort Myers
1008	6	Fort Pierce
1009	5	Gainsville

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

1039 6 Hallandale *

1010 2 Hialeah

1011 5 Hollywood

1012 4 Jacksonville

1040 2 Kendale Lakes *

1013 2 Kendall

1014 6 Key West

1015 6 Lakeland

1041 6 Lake Worth *

1042 2 Largo *

1043 6 Lauderdale Lakes *

1044 6 Lauderhill

1045 6 Margate *

1016 6 Melbourne

1017 6 Merritt Island

1018 4 Miami

1019 2 Miami Beach

1046 6 Miramar *

1020 2 North Miami

1021 2 North Miami Beach

1047 6 Ocala *

1048 2 Olympia Heights *

1022 5 Orlando

1023 6 Panama City

1049 6 Pembroke Pines *

1024 5 Pensacola

1050 6 Pine Hills *

1051 2 Pinellas Park *

1052 6 Plantation *

1025 6 Pompano Beach

1053 6 Port Charlotte *

1054 6 Riviera Beach *

1026 2 St. Petersburg

1027 6 Sarasota

1055 6 Sunrise *

1028 5 Tallahassee

1056 2 Tamarac *

1029 4 Tampa

1030 6 Titusville

1057 2 Town 'N' country *

1058 2 Westchester *

1059 2 West Little River *

1031 5 West Palm Beach

GEORGIA (144)

1100 5 Albany

1101 6 Athens

1102 4 Atlanta

1103 5 Augusta

1113 2 Candler-Mcafee *

1104 5 Columbus

1105 2 East Point

1106 6 Fort Benning

1114 2 Mableton *

1107 5 Macon

1108 2 Marietta

1115 2 North Atlanta *

1109 6 Rome

1116 2 Sandy Springs *

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

1110 5 Savannah
1117 6 South Augusta *
1118 2 Tucker *
1111 6 Valdosta
1112 6 Warner Robins

HAWAII (181)

1205 6 Aiea *
1200 6 Hilo
1201 4 Honolulu
1202 6 Kailua
1203 6 Kanoehē
1206 6 Pearl City *
1204 6 Waipahu

IDAHO (163)

1300 5 Boise City
1301 6 Idaho Falls
1302 6 Lewiston
1304 6 Nampa *
1303 6 Pocatello
1305 6 Twin Falls *

ILLINOIS (121)

1400 2 Addison
1401 2 Alton
1402 2 Arlington Heights
1403 2 Aurora
1404 2 Belleville
1405 2 Berwyn
1406 6 Bloomington
1461 2 Bolingbrook *
1407 2 Burbank
1408 2 Calumet City
1462 6 Carbondale *
1409 2 Carpentersville
1410 5 Champaign
1411 1 Chicago
1412 2 Chicago Heights
1413 2 Cicero
1414 6 Danville
1415 5 Decatur
1463 6 Dekalb *
1416 2 Des Plaines
1417 2 Dolton
1418 2 Downers Grove
1419 2 East St. Louis
1420 2 Elgin
1464 2 Elk Grove *
1421 2 Elmhurst
1422 2 Elmwood Park
1423 2 Evanston
1424 2 Evergreen Park
1425 6 Freeport
1426 6 Galesburg
1427 2 Glenview
1428 2 Granite City
1465 2 Hanover Park *
1429 2 Harvey

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

1430 2 Highland Park
1466 2 Hoffman Estates *
1431 2 Joliet
1432 6 Kankakee
1433 2 Lansing
1434 2 Lombard
1435 2 Maywood
1436 6 Moline
1437 2 Morton Grove
1438 2 Mount Prospect
1467 2 Naperville *
1439 2 Niles
1440 6 Normal
1441 2 Northbrook
1442 2 North Chicago
1468 2 Oak Forest *
1443 2 Oak Lawn
1444 2 Oak Park
1445 2 Palatine
1446 2 Park Forest
1447 2 Park Ridge
1448 6 Pekin
1449 5 Peoria
1450 6 Quincy
1451 6 Rantoul
1452 5 Rockford
1453 5 Rock Island
1469 2 Schaumburg *
1454 2 Skokie
1470 2 South Holland *
1455 5 Springfield
1471 2 Tinley Park *
1456 6 Urbana
1457 2 Villa Park
1458 2 Waukegan
1459 2 Wheaton
1460 2 Wilmette

INDIANA (122)
1500 5 Anderson
1501 6 Bloomington
1502 6 Columbus
1503 2 East Chicago
1504 6 Elkhart
1505 5 Evansville
1506 5 Fort Wayne
1507 2 Gary
1508 2 Hammond
1509 2 Highland
1510 4 Indianapolis
1511 6 Kokomo
1512 6 Lafayette
1521 2 Lawrence *
1513 6 Marion
1522 2 Merrillville *
1514 6 Michigan City
1515 6 Mishawaka
1516 5 Muncie
1517 6 New Albany

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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 Wichita

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

1914 2 Chalmette *
1903 2 Gretna
1904 6 Houma
1905 2 Kenner
1906 5 Lafayette
1907 5 Lake Charles
1908 2 Marrero
1909 2 Metairie
1910 5 Monroe
1911 6 New Iberia
1912 4 New Orleans
1913 5 Shreveport
1915 2 Slidell *

MAINE (102)

2000 6 Auburn
2001 6 Bangor
2002 6 Lewiston
2003 5 Portland

MARYLAND (152)

2100 2 Annapolis
2123 2 Aspen Hill *
2101 4 Baltimore
2102 2 Bethesda
2103 2 Bowie
2104 2 Catonsville
2105 2 Chillum
2106 2 College Park
2124 2 Columbia *
2107 6 Cumberland
2108 2 Dundalk
2109 2 Essex
2125 6 Frederick *
2126 2 Gaithersburg
2110 2 Glen Burnie
2111 6 Hagerstown
2112 9 Hillcrest Heights
2127 2 Lochearn *
2113 2 Lutherville-Timonium
2128 2 Middle River *
2129 2 Oxen Hill *
2114 2 Parkville
2115 2 Pikesville
2130 2 Potomac *
2116 2 Randallstown
2117 2 Rockville
2131 2 Security *
2118 2 Silver Spring
2119 2 Suitland-Silver Hills
2120 2 Towson
2121 2 Wheaton-Glenmont

MASSACHUSETTS (103)

2260 6 Agawam *
2200 6 Amherst
2201 6 Andover
2202 2 Arlington
2203 6 Attleboro

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

2261	6	Barnstable *
2204	2	Belmont
2205	2	Beverly
2206	6	Billerica
2207	4	Boston
2208	2	Braintree
2209	5	Brockton
2210	2	Brookline
2211	2	Cambridge
2212	6	Chelmsford
2213	2	Chelsea
2214	5	Chicopee
2215	2	Danvers
2216	2	Dedham
2217	2	Everett
2218	5	Fall River
2219	6	Fitchburg
2220	2	Framingham
2221	6	Gloucester
2222	6	Havershill
2223	5	Holyoke
2224	5	Lawrence
2225	6	Leominster
2226	2	Lexington
2227	5	Lowell
2228	5	Lynn
2229	2	Malden
2230	6	Marlborough
2231	2	Medford
2232	2	Melrose
2233	6	Methuen
2234	2	Milton
2235	2	Natick
2236	2	Needham
2237	5	New Bedford
2238	2	Newton
2239	6	Northampton
2240	2	Norwood
2241	2	Peabody
2242	5	Pittsfield
2262	6	Plymouth *
2243	2	Quincy
2244	2	Randolph
2245	2	Revere
2246	2	Salem
2247	2	Saugus
2248	2	Somerville
2249	5	Springfield
2263	2	Stoughton *
2250	2	Taunton
2251	2	Wakefield
2252	2	Waltham
2253	2	Watertown
2254	2	Wellesley
2255	6	Westfield
2256	6	West Springfield
2257	2	Weymouth
2258	2	Woburn
2259	5	Worcester

MICHIGAN (123)

2300	2	Allen Park
2301	5	Ann Arbor
2345	2	Avon Twp. *
2302	6	Battle Creek
2303	6	Bay City
2304	2	Birmingham
2346	2	Bloomfield Twp. *
2347	6	Burton *
2348	2	Clinton Twp *
2305	2	Dearborn
2306	2	Dearborn Heights
2307	1	Detroit
2308	2	East Detroit
2309	6	East Lansing
2349	2	Farmington Hills *
2310	2	Ferndale
2311	5	Flint
2312	2	Garden City
2313	5	Grand Rapids
2314	2	Hamtramck
2315	2	Highland Park
2316	6	Holland
2317	2	Inkster
2318	6	Jackson
2319	5	Kalamazoo
2350	6	Kentwood *
2320	5	Lansing
2321	2	Lincoln Park
2322	2	Livonia
2323	2	Madison Heights
2324	6	Midland
2325	6	Muskegon
2326	2	Oak Park
2327	2	Pontiac
2328	6	Portage
2329	6	Port Huron
2351	2	Redford Twp. *
2352	2	Romulus *
2330	2	Roseville
2331	2	Royal Oak
2332	5	Saginaw
2333	2	St. Clair Shores
2334	2	Southfield
2335	2	Southgate
2336	2	Sterling Heights
2337	2	Taylor
2338	2	Trenton
2339	2	Troy
2340	2	Warren
2353	2	Waterford *
2354	2	West Bloomfield Twp. *
2341	2	Westland
2342	2	Wyandotte
2343	5	Wyoming
2344	6	Ypsilanti

MINNESOTA (133)

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

2400 6 Austin
2423 2 Blaine *
2401 2 Bloomington
2402 2 Brooklyn Center
2403 6 Brooklyn Park
2424 2 Burnsville *
2404 2 Coon Rapids
2405 2 Crystal
2406 5 Duluth
2407 2 Edina
2408 2 Fridley
2409 2 Golden Valley
2410 6 Mankato
2411 9 Maplewood
2412 4 Minneapolis
2413 2 Minnetonka
2414 6 Moorhead
2425 2 Plymouth *
2415 2 Richfield
2416 5 Rochester
2417 2 Roseville
2418 6 St. Cloud
2419 2 St. Louis Park
2420 4 St. Paul
2421 2 South St. Paul
2422 6 Winona

MISSISSIPPI (146)

2500 6 Biloxi
2501 6 Columbus
2502 6 Greenville
2503 6 Gulfport
2504 6 Hattiesburg
2505 5 Jackson
2506 6 Laurel
2507 6 Meridian
2508 6 Pascagoula
2509 6 Vicksburg

MISSOURI (134)

2600 2 Affton
2620 2 Blue Springs *
2601 6 Cape Girardeau
2602 5 Columbia
2603 2 Ferguson
2604 2 Florissant
2605 6 Fort Leonard Wood
2621 2 Gladstone *
2606 2 Independence
2607 6 Jefferson City
2608 4 Joplin
2609 4 Kansas City
2610 2 Kirkwood
2622 2 Lee's Summit *
2611 2 Lemay
2612 2 Overland
2613 2 Raytown
2614 2 St. Charles
2615 5 St. Joseph

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

2616	4	St. Louis
2617	5	Springfield
2618	2	University City
2619	2	Webster Groves
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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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
3163 2 Parsippany--Troy Hills *
3143 2 Passaic
3144 2 Paterson
3145 2 Pennsauken Twp.
3146 2 Perth Amboy
3147 2 Piscataway Twp.
3148 2 Plainfield
3149 2 Rahway
3150 2 Ridgewood
3151 2 Sayreville
3152 2 Teaneck Twp.
3153 5 Trenton
3154 2 Union Twp.
3155 2 Union City
3156 6 Vineland
3157 2 Wayne Twp.
3158 2 Westfield
3159 2 West New York
3160 5 West Orange
3161 2 Willingboro Twp.
3162 2 Woodbridge Twp.

NEW MEXICO (166)

3200 5 Albuquerque
3207 6 Carlsbad *
3201 6 Clovis
3208 6 Farmington *
3202 6 Hobbs
3203 6 Las Cruces
3204 6 Roswell
3205 6 Santa Fe
3206 6 South Valley

NEW YORK (113)

3300 5 Albany
3301 6 Amsterdam
3302 6 Auburn
3303 2 Baldwin
3304 5 Binghamton
3305 2 Brentwood
3354 6 Brighton *
3306 4 Buffalo
3355 2 Centereach *

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

3307	2	Central Islip
3356	2	Cheektowaga *
3308	2	Commack
3309	2	Deer Park
3357	2	Dix Hills *
3310	2	East Meadow
3311	6	Elmira
3312	2	Elmont
3313	2	Franklin Square
3314	2	Freeport
3315	2	Garden City
3316	2	Glen Cove
3317	2	Hempstead
3318	2	Hicksville
3319	2	Huntington Station
3358	6	Irondequoit *
3320	6	Ithaca
3321	6	Jamestown
3322	6	Kingston
3323	2	Lackawanna
3359	2	Lake Ronkonkoma *
3324	2	Levittown
3325	2	Lindenhurst
3326	2	Lockport
3327	2	Long Beach
3328	2	Massapequa
3329	2	Merrick
3330	2	Mount Vernon
3331	6	Newburgh
3332	2	New City
3333	2	New Rochelle
3334	1	New York
3335	2	Niagara Falls
3336	2	North Babylon
3360	2	North Bay Shore *
3337	2	North Tonawanda
3338	2	Oceanside
3339	2	Plainview
3340	2	Port Chester
3341	6	Poughkeepsie
3342	4	Rochester
3343	2	Rockville Centre
3344	5	Rome
3345	6	Rotterdam
3346	5	Schenectady
3361	2	Smithtown *
3347	5	Syracuse
3362	2	Tonawanda *
3348	5	Troy
3349	5	Utica
3350	2	Valley Stream
3351	6	Watertown
3363	2	West Babylon *
3364	2	West Islip *
3365	2	West Senaca *
3352	2	White Plains
3353	2	Yonkers

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

3400 5 Asheville
3401 6 Burlington
3402 6 Camp Lejeune
3403 6 Chapel Hill
3404 5 Charlotte
3405 5 Durham
3406 5 Fayetteville
3407 6 Fort Bragg
3408 6 Gastonia
3409 6 Goldsboro
3410 5 Greensboro
3411 6 Greenville
3412 5 High Point
3413 6 Kannapolis
3419 6 Kinston *
3414 5 Raleigh
3415 6 Rocky Mount
3416 6 Wilmington
3417 6 Wilson
3418 5 Winston-Salem

NORTH DAKOTA (136)

3500 6 Bismarck
3501 5 Fargo
3502 6 Grand Forks
3503 6 Minot

OHIO (124)

3600 4 Akron
3601 6 Alliance
3602 6 Athens
3603 6 Austintown
3604 6 Barberton
3651 6 Beavercreek *
3605 6 Boardman
3652 6 Bowling Green *
3606 2 Brook Park
3653 2 Brunswick *
3607 5 Canton
3608 4 Cincinnati
3609 4 Cleveland
3610 2 Cleveland Heights
3611 4 Columbus
3612 6 Cuyahoga Falls
3613 5 Dayton
3654 2 Delhi Hills
3614 2 East Cleveland
3615 5 Elyria
3616 2 Euclid
3617 6 Fairborn
3655 6 Fairfield *
3618 6 Findlay
3619 2 Garfield Heights
3620 5 Hamilton
3656 6 Huber Heights *
3621 6 Kent
3622 5 Kettering
3623 2 Lakewood
3624 6 Lancaster

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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

PENNSYLVANIA (114)

3928	2	Abington Twp. *
3900	5	Allentown
3901	5	Altoona
3902	9	Baldwin
3929	2	Bensalem Twp. *
3903	2	Bethel Park
3904	5	Bethlehem
3930	2	Bristol Twp. *
3931	2	Cheltenham *
3905	2	Chester
3906	6	Easton
3907	5	Erie
3932	2	Falls Twp. *
3908	5	Harrisburg
3933	2	Haverford Twp. *
3909	6	Hazleton
3910	6	Johnstown
3911	5	Lancaster
3912	6	Lebanon
3934	2	Lower Merion Twp. *
3935	2	Mccandless Twp. *
3913	2	Mckeesport
3914	2	Monroeville
3936	2	Mount Lebanon *
3915	6	New Castle
3916	2	Norristown
3937	2	Penn Hills *
3917	1	Philadelphia
3918	4	Pittsburgh
3938	2	Plum *
3919	2	Pottstown
3939	2	Radnor Twp. *
3920	5	Reading
3940	2	Ridley Twp. *
3941	2	Ross Twp. *
3921	5	Scranton
3942	2	Shaler Twp. *
3943	2	Springfield *
3922	6	State College
3944	2	Upper Darby *
3945	2	Upper Merion *
3946	2	Upper Moreland Twp. *
3947	2	Warminster *
3923	2	West Mifflin
3924	5	Wilkes-Barre
3925	2	Wilkesburg
3926	6	Williamsport
3927	5	York

RHODE ISLAND (105)

4012	6	Coventry *
4000	5	Cranston
4001	6	Cumberland
4002	6	East Providence
4003	6	Middletown
4004	6	Newport
4005	6	North Kingstown
4006	6	North Providence

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

4007 5 Pawtucket
4008 5 Providence
4009 5 Warwick
4010 6 West Warwick
4011 6 Woonsocket

SOUTH CAROLINA (148)

4100 6 Anderson
4101 5 Charleston
4102 5 Columbia
4103 6 Florence
4104 5 Greenville
4108 6 North Charleston *
4105 6 Rock Hill
4106 6 Spartanburg
4107 6 Sumter

SOUTH DAKOTA (137)

4200 6 Aberdeen
4201 6 Rapid City
4202 5 Sioux Falls

TENNESSEE (154)

4300 5 Chattanooga
4301 6 Clarksville
4310 6 Cleveland *
4311 6 Columbia *
4312 6 Hendersonville *
4302 6 Jackson
4303 6 Johnson City
4304 6 Kingsport
4305 5 Knoxville
4306 4 Memphis
4307 6 Murfreesboro
4308 4 Nashville-Davidson
4309 6 Oak Ridge

TEXAS (149)

4400 5 Abilene
4401 5 Amarillo
4402 5 Arlington
4403 4 Austin
4404 2 Baytown
4405 5 Beaumont
4406 6 Big Spring
4407 5 Brownsville
4408 6 Bryan
4447 2 Carrollton *
4448 6 College Station *
4409 5 Corpus Christi
4410 4 Dallas
4449 6 Del Rio *
4411 6 Denison
4412 2 Denton
4450 2 Duncanville *
4413 4 El Paso
4414 2 Farmers Branch
4415 9 Fort Hood
4416 4 Fort Worth

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

4704 5 Chesapeake
4720 2 Dale City *
4705 6 Danville
4706 5 Hampton
4707 9 Jefferson
4708 5 Lynchburg
4721 2 Mclean *
4709 5 Newport News
4710 4 Norfolk
4711 6 Petersburg
4712 5 Portsmouth
4722 2 Reston *
4713 4 Richmond
4714 5 Roanoke
4715 6 Staunton
4723 6 Suffolk *
4724 6 Tuckahoe *
4716 5 Virginia Beach
4725 2 West Springfield *
4717 2 Woodbridge-Marumsco

WASHINGTON (173)

4815 2 Auburn *
4800 2 Bellevue
4801 6 Bellingham
4802 6 Bremerton
4803 2 Edmonds
4804 2 Everett
4805 6 Fort Lewis
4816 6 Kennewick *
4806 9 Lakes District
4807 6 Longview
4817 6 Olympia *
4808 2 Renton
4809 6 Richland
4810 4 Seattle
4811 5 Spokane
4812 2 Tacoma
4813 5 Vancouver
4818 6 Walla Walla *
4814 6 Yakima

WEST VIRGINIA (156)

4900 5 Charleston
4901 6 Fairmont
4902 5 Huntington
4903 6 Morgantown
4904 6 Parkersburg
4905 6 Weirton
4906 6 Wheeling

WISCONSIN (125)

5000 5 Appleton
5001 6 Beloit
5002 2 Brookfield
5003 6 Eau Claire
5004 6 Fond Du Lac
5005 5 Green Bay
5006 2 Greenfield

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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 026-027,	(023-024, 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 chiropractors, optometrists, pharmacists, veterinarians, dieticians, registered nurses, etc.	(086-089, 095- 106)
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 clergy and other religious workers, social and recreation workers, editors and reporters, public relations persons, etc.	(026, 027, 034, 174-177, 195, 197)

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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) 025,	(003-019, 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, 803, 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)

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

- 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

- 180. Christian and Missionary Alliance (CMA)
- 181. Church of God (Anderson, IN)
- 182. Church of the Nazarene
- 183. Free Methodist Church
- 184. Salvation Army
- 185. Wesleyan Church
- 186. Church of God of Findlay, OH [1994]
- 199. Holiness (NFS); Church of God (NFS); R not or NA whether R Pentecostal or Charismatic

INDEPENDENT-FUNDAMENTALIST

- 200. Plymouth Brethren
- 201. Independent Fundamentalist Churches of America
- 219. Independent-Fundamentalist (NFS)

LUTHERAN

- 220. Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (formerly Lutheran Church in America and The American Lutheran Church); ELCA
- 221. Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod; LC-MS
- 222. Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod; WELS
- 223. Other Conservative Lutheran
- 229. Lutheran (NFS)

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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

- 180. Christian and Missionary Alliance (CMA)
- 181. Church of God (Anderson, IN)
- 182. Church of the Nazarene
- 183. Free Methodist Church
- 184. Salvation Army
- 185. Wesleyan Church
- 186. Church of God of Findlay, OH
- 199. Holiness (NFS); Church of God (NFS); R not or NA
whether R Pentecostal or Charismatic

INDEPENDENT-FUNDAMENTALIST

- 200. Plymouth Brethren
- 201. Independent Fundamentalist Churches of America
- 219. Independent-Fundamentalist (NFS)

LUTHERAN

- 220. Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (formerly
Lutheran Church in America and The American
Lutheran Church); ELCA
- 221. Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod; LC-MS
- 222. Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod; WELS
- 223. Other Conservative Lutheran
- 229. Lutheran (NFS)

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
- 240. Congregational Methodist (fundamentalist)* [1996]
- 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
- 254. Pentecostal Church of God
- 255. Pentecostal Holiness Church
- 256. United Pentecostal Church International
- 257. Church of God in Christ (incl. NA whether 258)
- 258. Church of God in Christ (International)
- 260. Church of God of the Apostolic Faith
- 261. Church of God of Prophecy
- 262. Vineyard Fellowship [1994]
- 267. Apostolic Pentecostal
- 268. Spanish Pentecostal
- 269. Pentecostal (NFS); Church of God (NFS); R not or
NA whether R Pentecostal or Charismatic

PRESBYTERIAN

- 270. Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

- 271. Cumberland Presbyterian Church
- 272. Presbyterian Church in American (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

JEWISH

- 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-JEWISH

- 720. Muslim; Mohammedan; Islam

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

- 721. Buddhist
- 722. Hindu
- 723. Bahai
- 724. American Indian Religions (Native American Religions)
- 729. Other non-Christian/non-Jewish
- 790. Religious/ethical cults

OTHER

- 800. Agnostics
- 801. Atheists
- 997. Other

□>> MASTER CODE

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.
- 08. Pro-life issues; anti-abortion; anti partial-birth abortions. Right to life.; abortion, partial-birth abortions.
- 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.

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.

56. Fishing rights (between US and Canada). Boundary problem.
 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).
 80. Structure/function of local government. E.g. Village being annexed.
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

01. Pork barrel legislation. Spending in one state to get votes for something else. Deal making. Trade-offs.
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.
11. Welfare, Public assistance. Food stamps. Welfare to work program. All mentions of receiving assistance from the government.
12. Education (all mentions). Student loans; aid to education.
13. Housing/Urban Development. Housing assistance or subsidies.
14. Social programs, NFS. Liberal programs. Social concerns.
15. Affirmative Action/Minority rights programs.
16. Social Security.
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

50. Government operations in general. The bureaucracy. Duplication of effort. Overspending for toilet seats, hammers.
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.
54. Government investigations. Investigating itself. Whitewater investigation.
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.
71. Tax breaks to corporations. Government letting big business off.
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

-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 Marrieds
 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

- 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;

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

Women in menopause in their 50s

- 116 Caucasian Young Females
- 132 Single women
- 151 Business Women

117 Gay

FAMILY

-FAMILY

120 Married

- See Also: 121 Young Marrieds
122 Married Families
163 Housewife

123 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

- 133 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

anes_mergedfile_1992to1997_appendix_codebook.txt

- 158 Truck Driver; People that make their living on the highway
- 159 Railroad
- 160 Military Personnel
- 161 Blue Collar Workers; High paid blue collar worker
See Also: 38 Middle-Class Blue Collar Group

-OTHER OCCUPATION REFERENCE

- 162 Self-employed
- 163 Housewife
- 164 Peace Corp volunteer

GEOGRAPHY

- 170 Neighbors; My neighborhood; People in the neighborhood
- 171 Rural; Rural area people; The country people
- 172 Urban; The city; Inner city person
- 173 Suburban
- 174 (Reference to a State); Texans
- 175 People in my Community
See Also: 86 Senior Community Complex

-AMERICANS

- 176 (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

- 180 (Media-related Interests); Those who listen to radio part time; Newspaper readers; People who listen to public radio; NPR
- 181 (Reading-related Interests); Readers of science fiction; Interested in reading, fiction reading mainly; Literary group (like friends of the library)
- 182 (Sports Activities or Fans); Ohio State Football Fan; Golfing league; Bowling; Eastern Stars camping group; Sporting groups, hunting and fishing
- 183 (Arts-related Interests); Actively involved in the theater; Music and theater; People who are interested in the arts
- 184 (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
- 185 (Traveling); World travelers

PEOPLE R HAS CONTACT WITH

- 190 Friends; Close friends
See Also: 17 Christian friends.
- 191 Co-workers; People that I work [with]; My office mate
- 192 (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.