

I. GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE 1989 PILOT STUDY

The NES/CPS 1989 Pilot Study was conducted by the Center for Political Studies of the Institute for Social Research, under the general direction of Warren E. Miller, Steven J. Rosenstone and Donald R. Kinder. Santa Traugott is the Project Manager. Zoanne Blackburn managed the study for the Survey Research Center's Telephone Facility. Giovanna Morchio of the NES project staff prepared the data for release. The study was conducted under the auspices of National Science Foundation Grants SES-8341310 and SES-8808361, providing long-term support for the national election studies. Since 1978 the NES election studies have been designed by a National Board of Overseers, the members of which meet several times a year to plan content and administration of the major study components.

Board members during the planning of the 1989 Pilot Study included: Morris P. Fiorina, Harvard University, Chair; Richard A. Brody, Stanford University; Stanley Feldman, University of Kentucky; Edie N. Goldenberg, University of Michigan; Gary C. Jacobson, University of California, San Diego; Stanley Kelley, Jr., Princeton University; Donald R. Kinder, the University of Michigan; Thomas Mann, The Brookings Institution; Douglas Rivers, the University of California at Los Angeles; Ray Wolfinger, the University of California at Berkeley; Warren E. Miller, Arizona State University, ex officio; and Steven J. Rosenstone, University of Michigan, ex officio.

Work on the Pilot Study was initiated by a "**stimulus letter**" sent in December 1988 to the NES mailing list, soliciting advice in general about the new items to be piloted and specifically in the areas of predispositions, issues, question frames and survey response, retrospective assessments, political cognition, and the use of mass media. Responses to the stimulus letter were considered at the Board's meeting in February 1989, and certain proposers, as well as members of the Board, were asked to join a Pilot Study Committee for detailed planning of the 1989 Pilot Study.

The 1989 Pilot Study Committee consists of, from the Board or ex-officio; Rivers (Chair), Kelley, Kinder, Miller and Rosenstone. Other members of the Pilot Study Committee were: David Leege, the University of Notre Dame; Gregory A. **Markus**, the University of Michigan, Vincent Price, the University of Michigan and John Zaller, the University of California, Los Angeles. The Pilot Study Committee met in Ann Arbor in early April to plan the design and content of the study. The April meeting was preceded by a two-day meeting in March at Notre Dame of a Working Group on Religious Measures. Those attending that meeting were: David Leege, Clark Roof (University of Massachusetts), Lyman **Kellstedt** (Wheaton College) Ken Wald (University of Florida) and Santa Traugott.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE 1989 PILOT STUDY

A. CONTENT. The 1989 Pilot Study, like its predecessors in 1979, 1983, 1985, and 1987, provided an opportunity for social scientists to refine existing NES measures and develop and test new instrumentation. This Pilot Study carries new measures of religious identity and the political salience of religion, media exposure and the type of information recalled, individualism, represented by four predispositions to autonomy, self reliance, laissez-faire and limited government. A significant portion of the study was devoted to experiments contrasting different instrumentation for issue questions: seven point scales versus branching, framed versus stripped, unipolar versus bipolar scales, labeled scales versus unlabeled, filtered versus unfiltered questions. A ten point scale for the feeling thermometer was tested against the traditional one hundred point scale. New items on gun control, abortion and the Alaska oil spill were also piloted.

B. SAMPLING The 1989 Pilot Study respondents are a subsample of respondents to the 1988 Pre-Post Election Survey. The sample selection for the Pilot was restricted to the 1640 Pre/Post respondents who completed both the pre and post interview and who gave us their telephone number. Since people who are less involved and interested in politics drop out of panel studies at a higher rate than do the more politically involved, the use of a straight **equal** probability sample strategy to draw the pilot sample seemed undesirable. Such a strategy would have yielded a disproportionately well-informed group of respondents. In order to ensure that the pilot sample is representative of the Pre-Post respondents, a dual sampling procedure combining an equal probability sample with an oversample disproportionately allocated across 5 strata defined by the Political Information Index was used. (The sampling design was also used in the 1987 Pilot Study.) Within each stratum the sample rate was set to the inverse probability of response. The probability of response was defined as the actual response rate obtained by the 1985 Pilot in the five information categories (with a minor correction for category 3). The expected response rate for strata 1 (lowest information score) was set to 56%, 72% for stratas 2 and 3, 82% for strata 4 and 87% for strata 5 (highest information score). The total Pilot sample comprises 855 respondents. In **order to** preserve comparability with Pilot Studies prior to 1987, the sampling section resampled the 1989 Pilot Study sample control file, reconstructing a data subset (smaller **n=708**) with the equal probability (**EPSEM**) sample design properties and nonresponse characteristics of past Pilot Studies. Variable 7012 can be used to obtain an equal probability sample for analysis purpose.

The Political Information Index is modeled on Zaller's 1987 Index and is based on the following variables:

- Recall of House candidates
- **Identification** of Political Figures: Kennedy, Schultz, Rehnquist, Gorbachev, Thatcher, Arafat, Wright.
- Knowledge of Majority Party both in the House and Senate before the election
- Knowledge of relative position of Democratic and Republican Party on Issues:
 - Liberal/conservative placement of Reagan
 - Liberal/Conservative placement of parties
 - Parties placement on defense spending
 - Parties placement on social services spending
 - Parties placement on health insurance
 - Parties placement on job/standard of living
 - Parties placement on women roles
- Interviewer estimate of respondent political information

The component variables were considered to have missing data only if they were coded as Not Ascertained, **DKs** were treated as low information level. The Recall of candidate names vars were given double weight by being used twice (with a more or less stringent requirement to qualify as correct). The interviewer evaluation of the respondent political knowledge was weighted by a factor of 4, by using 4 different versions of the variable. The knowledge of the relative standing of the parties on issues required that the respondent would have placed the parties within at least 2 point difference of each other in the "correct direction". The 2 point difference criteria applied to all placements except for "**women roles**" where only a 1 point difference was required. The Information Index was the straight sum of all the component variable, correcting for missing data. A maximum of ten variables with missing data were allowed. The resulting variable, number 7011 in this release, was used to divide the sample in g-uintiles.

C. STUDY ADMINISTRATION. The Pilot Study can be thought of as a four-wave panel. A subsample of 614 respondents to the 1988 Pre-Post Election Study were reinterviewed between July 6 and August 1, 1989: 494 of those people were reinterviewed between September 6 and October 6, 1989. The ICPSR **dataset** includes variables from the 1988 Pre-Post for the 614 Pilot Study cases. To facilitate the testing of the new instrumentation, four forms were used in each of the two waves.

Response Rate. The overall response rate for Wave 1 was 74% (614 respondents). The response rate for each strata after **controlling** for non-sample, were 65% for strata 1, 67% for each strata 2, 76% for strata 3, 82% for strata 4 and 87% for strata 5. Except **for** strata 1, where the actual response rate was 9% higher than expected, the response rate for stratas 2 to 5 are within 5% points from the expected. The response rate for Wave 2 was 80%.

D. A NOTE ON DOCUMENTATION. The Pilot Study has four forms, and the question format and order experiments across forms has made documentation especially difficult. In addition, it is a CATI study, and, except for the religion section (see below) there are no "paper and, pencil" questionnaires to which a user can refer where the documentation is not clear. We have tried to be cognizant of this throughout the documentation itself, inserting boxed notes in boldfaced type to describe experiments. Also, in the user documentation section, we have laid out outlines of Waves 1 and 2 which lay out in chart form the contents of the questionnaires. The particularly confusing religion series in section C of Wave 2 is laid out in a questionnaire format in the user documentation.

Throughout **the** questionnaire, form notation, e.g., (A,B) under the variable number means that only data for these forms appear in this variable with respondents from other forms being assigned missing data values. Form notation under the question number means that wording was different across forms, although data for the forms may be combined in the same variable.