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>> 1991 PILOT - 1990 STUDY DESCRIPTION

THE 1990 PILOT FILE ALSO CONTAINS 1990 VARIABLES FOR
THE RESPONDENTS.

1990 STUDY DESCRIPTION

THE NES/CPS AMERICAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY 1990 WAS
CONDUCTED BY THE CENTER FOR POLITICAL STUDIES OF THE
INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH, UNDER THE GENERAL DIRECTION
OF WARREN E. MILLER, DONALD R. KINDER AND STEVEN J.
ROSENSTONE. SANTA TRAUGOTT IS THE PROJECT MANAGER FOR THE
NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES. GIOVANNA MORCHIO WAS THE 1990
ELECTION STUDY MANAGER FOR NES, OVERSEEING THE STUDY FROM
VERY EARLY PLANNING STAGES THROUGH DATA RELEASE.

THIS IS THE TWENTY-FIRST IN A SERIES OF STUDIES OF AMERICAN
NATIONAL ELECTIONS PRODUCED BY THE POLITICAL BEHAVIOR
PROGRAM OF THE SURVEY RESEARCH CENTER AND THE CENTER FOR
POLITICAL STUDIES, AND IT IS THE SEVENTH SUCH STUDY TO BE
CONDUCTED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION
GRANTS (SOC77-08885 AND SES-8341310) 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 1990 NATIONAL
ELECTION STUDY INCLUDED: MORRIS P. FIORINA, HARVARD UNIVERSITY, CHAIR; RICHARD A. BRODY, STANFORD UNIVERSITY; STANLEY FELDMAN, UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY; EDIE N. GOLDENBERG, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN; MARY JACKMAN, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT DAVIS; GARY C. JACOBSON, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT SAN DIEGO; STANLEY KELLEY, JR., PRINCETON UNIVERSITY; THOMAS MANN, THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION; DOUGLAS RIVERS, STANFORD UNIVERSITY; JOHN ZALLER, THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES; WARREN E. MILLER, ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY, EX OFFICIO; DONALD R. KINDER, AND STEVEN J. ROSENSTONE, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, EX OFFICIO.

AS PART OF THE PLANNING PROCESS, A SPECIAL PLANNING COMMITTEE WAS APPOINTED, A PILOT STUDY CONDUCTED, AND STIMULUS LETTERS SENT TO THE MEMBERS OF THE SCHOLARLY COMMUNITY SOLICITING INPUT ON STUDY PLANS. THE 1990 STUDY PLANNING COMMITTEE INCLUDED KINDER AND MILLER; SEVERAL BOARD MEMBERS (MANN, CO-CHAIR; BRODY; FELDMAN; JACKMAN; MILLER, EX OFFICIO; AND ROSENSTONE, EX-OFFICIO AND CO-CHAIR) AND FOUR OTHER SCHOLARS (JON KROSNIK, OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY; GREGORY MARKUS AND VINCENT PRICE, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, AND DAVID LEEGE, NOTRE DAME UNIVERSITY).


1990 SURVEY CONTENT


THE ITEMS THAT FALL INTO THE TIME-SERIES, OR "CORE" CATEGORY, ARE: CAMPAIGN ATTENTION; LIKES AND DISLIKES OF POLITICAL PARTIES; LIKES AND DISLIKES OF CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATES; CONTACT WITH CONGRESSPERSON OR CANDIDATE; VOTE FOR REPRESENTATIVE, SENATOR AND GOVERNOR; MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM; CAMPAIGN ACTIVITIES; SYSTEM SUPPORT AND EFFICACY
ITEMS; FEELING THERMOMETER RATINGS OF CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATES AND GROUPS; RETROSPECTIVE ECONOMIC EVALUATIONS

(NATIONAL AND INDIVIDUAL); LIBERAL-CONSERVATIVE SCALE (WITH PROXIMITIES); PARTY IDENTIFICATION, SEVEN-POINT ISSUE SCALES WITH PLACEMENTS; FEDERAL BUDGET PREFERENCES; VIEWS ON ABORTION; AND THE STANDARD AND EXTENSIVE BATTERY OF DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS.

A NUMBER OF QUESTIONS ARE NEW OR RELATIVELY NEW TO THE STUDY. SOME CAME FROM THE PILOTING WORK DESCRIBED ABOVE--E.G., THE NEW MEASURES OF DENOMINATIONAL AFFILIATION; INDIVIDUALISM; AND ATTITUDES TOWARD ABORTION AND DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN. OTHERS WERE DESIGNED TO REFLECT TOPICAL CONCERNS OF THE CAMPAIGN. ITEMS IN THIS CATEGORY INCLUDE SOME FOREIGN POLICY ISSUE ITEMS RELATING TO CHANGES IN EASTERN EUROPE AND TO EVENTS IN THE PERSIAN GULF; AND KNOWLEDGE OF AND ATTITUDES ABOUT THE FAILURES OF THE SAVINGS AND LOANS FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND ABOUT THE FEDERAL BUDGET DEFICIT.

1990 SURVEY ADMINISTRATION

TWO FORMS WERE USED IN ORDER TO INCORPORATE THE MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF CONTENT. (EVEN SO, THE AVERAGE LENGTH OF THE SURVEY INTERVIEW WAS 78 MINUTES.) HALF OF THE STUDY SAMPLE WAS RANDOMLY ASSIGNED TO FORM A, AND THE OTHER HALF TO FORM B. MORE THAN 75 PERCENT OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE CONTENT WAS THE SAME IN BOTH FORMS; FORM A HAD ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS RELATING TO VALUES AND INDIVIDUALISM; FORM B HAD ADDITIONAL CONTENT RELATING TO FOREIGN RELATIONS. IN ADDITION, THERE WAS A QUESTION FORM EXPERIMENT (BRANCHING ALTERNATIVES VS. A SEVEN-POINT SCALE).

IN THE POST-ELECTION SURVEY, RESPONDENTS ARE ASKED LENGTHY SERIES OF QUESTIONS ABOUT THEIR PARTICULAR CONGRESSPERSONS AND SENATORS. INTERVIEWERS MUST PRE-EDIT QUESTIONNAIRES TO FILL IN THE NAMES APPROPRIATE FOR THE STATE AND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT IN WHICH THE RESPONDENT IS LIVING (OR WAS LIVING DURING THE PRE-ELECTION INTERVIEW). INTERVIEWERS ARE SENT "CANDIDATE LISTS" FOR EACH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT IN THE SAMPLE SEGMENTS IN WHICH THEY ARE INTERVIEWING. EACH CANDIDATE AND SENATOR ON THAT LIST IS ASSIGNED A PARTICULAR NUMBER THAT REFLECTS HIS OR HER INCUMBENCY STATUS AND PARTY. (SEE CANDIDATE NUMBER CODE, APPENDIX NOTE 4.) PARTICULAR QUESTIONS IN THE SURVEY REQUIRE THE INSERTION BY THE INTERVIEWER DURING PRE-EDITING OF THE NAMES OF CANDIDATES WITH SPECIFIC NUMBERS. SEE, FOR EXAMPLE, Q. B13, THE FEELING THERMOMETER. 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 THE APPENDIX (NOTE 4) OF THIS DOCUMENTATION.

1990 NOTES ON CONFIDENTIAL VARIABLES

STARTING WITH THE 1986 ELECTION STUDY, OCCUPATION CODE VARIABLES HAVE BEEN RELEASED IN SOMEWHAT LESS DETAIL THAN IN
YEARS PAST. THE DATASET INCLUDES A TWO-DIGIT CODE WITH 71 CATEGORIES CORRESPONDING TO CENSUS BUREAU OCCUPATIONAL GROUPINGS. THOSE WHO HAVE NEED OF THE FULL OCCUPATION CODE FOR THEIR RESEARCH SHOULD CONTACT THE NES PROJECT STAFF FOR INFORMATION ABOUT THE CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH ACCESS TO THESE DATA 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 OVERSEEERS. 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 (VARIABLE 900541). THIS VARIABLE IS RESTRICTED FOR REASONS OF CONFIDENTIALITY, BUT ACCESS MAY BE PROVIDED TO LEGITIMATE SCHOLARS UNDER ESTABLISHED NES PROCEDURES.

1990 OPEN-ENDED MATERIALS


| TABLE 1 |
| 1990 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% |
1990 SAMPLING INFORMATION

STUDY POPULATION

THE STUDY POPULATION FOR THE 1990 NES IS DEFINED TO INCLUDE ALL UNITED STATES CITIZENS OF VOTING AGE ON OR BEFORE THE 1990 ELECTION DAY. ELIGIBLE CITIZENS MUST HAVE RESIDED IN HOUSING UNITS, OTHER THAN ON MILITARY RESERVATIONS, IN THE 48 COTERMINOUS STATES. THIS DEFINITION EXCLUDES PERSONS LIVING IN ALASKA OR HAWAII AND REQUIRES ELIGIBLE PERSONS TO HAVE BEEN BOTH A UNITED STATES CITIZEN AND 18 YEARS OF AGE ON OR BEFORE THE 6TH OF NOVEMBER 1990.

MULTI-STAGE AREA PROBABILITY SAMPLE DESIGN


PRIMARY STAGE SELECTION

THE SELECTION OF PRIMARY STAGE SAMPLING UNITS (PSU'S),[2] WHICH DEPENDING ON THE SAMPLE STRATUM ARE EITHER SMSA'S, 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 SMSA/NON-SMSA 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

-------------------


[2] IN SRC PUBLICATIONS AND SURVEY MATERIALS, THE TERM "PRIMARY AREA" IS USED INTERCHANGEABLY WITH THE MORE COMMON "PRIMARY STAGE UNIT" TERMINOLOGY.


SECOND STAGE SELECTION OF AREA SEGMENTS


A THREE-STEP PROCESS OF ORDERING THE SSU'S 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) PSU'S THE NUMBER OF SAMPLE AREA SEGMENTS VARIED IN PROPORTION TO THE SIZE OF THE PRIMARY STAGE UNIT, FROM A HIGH OF B=18 AREA SEGMENTS IN THE SR NEW YORK SMSA TO A LOW OF B=7 AREA SEGMENTS IN THE SMALLER SR PSU'S SUCH AS SAN FRANCISCO. A TOTAL OF B=6 AREA SEGMENTS

TABLE 3
PSU'S IN THE 1990 NES POST-ELECTION SURVEY
BY: SMSA STATUS AND REGION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>SMSA STATUS</th>
<th>NON SELF-REPRESENTING SMSA'S</th>
<th>SELF-REPRESENTING SMSA'S</th>
<th>NON-SMSA'S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NORTH-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST</td>
<td>NEW YORK, NY-NJ</td>
<td>BOSTON, MA*</td>
<td>SCHUYLER, NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PHILADELPHIA, PA-NJ</td>
<td>PITTSBURGH, PA*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEW HAVEN, CT</td>
<td>BUFFALO, NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATLANTIC CITY, NJ</td>
<td>NEW YORK, CT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MANCHESTER, NH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHERN</td>
<td>CHICAGO, IL</td>
<td>ST. LOUIS, MO*</td>
<td>SANILAC, MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL</td>
<td>DETROIT, MI</td>
<td>MILWAUKEE, WI</td>
<td>PHILLIPS, KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DAYTON, OH</td>
<td>DES MOINES, IA</td>
<td>MOWER, MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FORT WAYNE, IN</td>
<td>GRAND RAPIDS, MI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td>HOUSTON, TX*</td>
<td>BULLOCH, GA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BALTIMORE, MD*</td>
<td>HALE, TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BIRMINGHAM, AL</td>
<td>MONROE, AR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COLUMBUS, GA-AL</td>
<td>BEDFORD, TN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIAMI, FL</td>
<td>ROBESON, NC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LAKELAND, FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MCALLEN, TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WHEELING, WV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KNOXVILLE, TN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RICHMOND, VA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST</td>
<td>LOS ANGELES, CA</td>
<td>SEATTLE, WA</td>
<td>ELDORADO-ALBINE, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAN FRANCISCO, CA</td>
<td>DENVER, WY</td>
<td>CARBON, WY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ANAHEIM, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FRESNO, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EUGENE, OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: THE PSU'S MARKED WITH AN ASTERISK (*) ARE SELF-REPRESENTING FOR SAMPLE DESIGNS THAT USE THE TWO-THIRDS OR LARGER PORTION OF THE SAMPLE. FOR THE HALF-SAMPLE DESIGN, 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.

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 1990 NES WAS SYSTEMATICALLY SELECTED FROM THE HOUSING UNIT LISTINGS FOR THE SAMPLED AREA SEGMENTS.

THE OVERALL PROBABILITY OF SELECTION FOR 1990 NES HOUSEHOLDS WAS F=.00003761 OR .3761 IN 10,000. THE EQUAL PROBABILITY SAMPLE OF HOUSEHOLDS WAS ACHIEVED 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.

FOURTH STAGE RESPONDENT SELECTION

WITHIN EACH SAMPLED HOUSING UNIT, THE SRC INTERVIEWER PREPARED A COMPLETE LISTING OF ALL ELIGIBLE HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS. USING AN OBJECTIVE PROCEDURE DESCRIBED BY KISH[3] (1949), A SINGLE RESPONDENT WAS THEN SELECTED AT RANDOM TO BE INTERVIEWED. REGARDLESS OF CIRCUMSTANCES, NO SUBSTITUTIONS WERE PERMITTED FOR THE DESIGNATED RESPONDENT.

1990 SAMPLE DESIGN SPECIFICATIONS


| TABLE 4 |
| 1990 NATIONAL POST-ELECTION SURVEY |
| ORIGINAL SAMPLE DESIGN SPECIFICATIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS AND ACTUAL SAMPLE DESIGN OUTCOMES |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORIGINAL SPECIFICATIONS</th>
<th>ACTUAL OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMPLETED INTERVIEWS</td>
<td>1,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPONSE RATE</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ELIGIBLE SAMPLE HOUSEHOLDS       2,573          2,808

          OCCUPANCY/ELIGIBILITY RATE*       .87           .802

FINAL SAMPLE HU LISTINGS           3,256          3,503

          SAMPLE GROWTH FROM UPDATE**      1.05          1.068

SAMPLE LISTINGS FROM FRAME         3,100          3,280

-------------

* EXPECTED ELIGIBILITY (.97) X OCCUPANCY (.90)

** SINCE THE UPDATING PROCESS PRODUCES ABOUT A 5% INCREASE IN SAMPLE LINES OVER THE COUNT SELECTED FROM THE NATIONAL SAMPLE SYSTEM, THE UPDATE INFLATION FACTOR WAS SET AT 1.05.

1990 SAMPLE DESIGN OUTCOMES


WEIGHTED ANALYSIS OF 1990 NES DATA

THE AREA PROBABILITY SAMPLE DESIGN FOR THE 1990 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 THAT HAVE SHOWN THESE WEIGHTS TO HAVE LITTLE SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON THE VALUES OF NES ESTIMATES OF DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS.

THE CURRENT POLICY OF THE NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES IS NOT TO INCLUDE IN PUBLIC USE DATA SETS SPECIAL ANALYSIS WEIGHTS DESIGNED TO COMPENSATE FOR NONRESPONSE OR TO POST-STRATIFY THE SAMPLE TO KNOWN POPULATION DISTRIBUTION CONTROLS. 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.

SAMPLING ERRORS OF 1990 NES ESTIMATES

1990 SAMPLING ERROR CALCULATION PROGRAMS

THE PROBABILITY SAMPLE DESIGN FOR THE 1990 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 THAT 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 THAT 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.

1990 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 THAT REFLECT THE COMPLEX STRUCTURE OF THE SAMPLE AND ARE COMPATIBLE WITH THE COMPUTATION ALGORITHMS OF THE VARIOUS PROGRAMS. THE SAMPLING ERROR CODES FOR THE 1990 NES ARE INCLUDED AS A VARIABLE 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.

TABLE 5 PROVIDES A DESCRIPTION OF HOW INDIVIDUAL SAMPLING ERROR CODE VALUES ARE TO BE PAIRED FOR SAMPLING ERROR COMPUTATIONS. THIRTY (30) PAIRS OR STRATA OF SAMPLING ERROR COMPUTATION UNITS (SECU'S) 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 THAT IS COMPRISED OF CASES ASSIGNED SAMPLING CODE VALUES 36 AND 55 AND THE SECOND SECU IN STRATUM 29 THAT IS COMPRISED OF CASES WITH SECU'S 61 AND 63.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**1990 NES POST-ELECTION SURVEY**

**PAIRED SELECTION MODEL FOR SAMPLING ERROR COMPUTATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAIR (STRATUM)</th>
<th>1 OF 2 CODES</th>
<th>2 OF 2 CODES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>36 + 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61 + 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GENERALIZED SAMPLING ERROR RESULTS FOR THE 1990 NES**

TO ASSIST NES DATA ANALYSTS, THE OSIRIS PSALMS PROGRAM WAS USED TO COMPUTE SAMPLING ERRORS FOR A WIDE-RANGING SET OF
MEANS AND PROPORTIONS ESTIMATED FROM NES SURVEY DATA SETS.

FOR EACH ESTIMATE, SAMPLING ERRORS WERE COMPUTED FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE AND FOR FIFTEEN DEMOGRAPHIC AND POLITICAL AFFILIATION SUBCLASSES OF NES SAMPLES. THE RESULTS OF THESE SAMPLING ERROR COMPUTATIONS WERE THEN SUMMARIZED AND TRANSLATED INTO THE GENERAL USAGE SAMPLING ERROR TABLE PROVIDED IN TABLE 6.


THE GENERALIZED VARIANCE RESULTS PRESENTED IN TABLE 6 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 6
1990 NES POST-ELECTION SURVEY
GENERALIZED VARIANCE TABLE
APPROXIMATE STANDARD ERRORS FOR PERCENTAGES

FOR PERCENTAGE ESTIMATES NEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAMPLE N</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>40% OR 60%</th>
<th>30% OR 70%</th>
<th>20% OR 80%</th>
<th>10% OR 90%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>5.385</td>
<td>5.277</td>
<td>4.933</td>
<td>4.308</td>
<td>3.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.912</td>
<td>3.824</td>
<td>3.581</td>
<td>3.128</td>
<td>2.343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
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
2040 1.716  1.685  1.561  1.298  1.020

>> 1991 NES STAFF AND TECHNICAL PAPERS


BREHM, JOHN. (1985C) "QUESTION ORDERING EFFECTS ON REPORTED VOTE CHOICE." UNPUBLISHED MEMO, JULY 1985.


LAKE, CELINDA. (1983B) "COMPARISON OF 3-POINT, 5-POINT, AND 7-POINT SCALES FROM THE CATI EXPERIMENT 1982 ELECTION STUDY." MEMO TO NES BOARD OF OVERSEERS, NOVEMBER 1983.

MORCHIO, GIOVANNA. (1987) "TRENDS IN NES RESPONSE RATES." MEMO TO NES BOARD OF OVERSEERS.


NES STAFF. (UNDATED) "YEARS OF SCHOOLING." UNPUBLISHED STAFF MEMO.

NES STAFF. (UNDATED) "NEWSPAPER CODE." UNPUBLISHED STAFF MEMO.


TRAUGOTT, SANTA. (1985) "SAMPLE WEIGHTING IN NES PRE-POST ELECTION SURVEY, 1984: A REPORT TO THE BOARD OF
OVERSEERS, NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES," WORKING PAPER

TRAUGOTT, SANTA. (1985) "ASSESSMENT OF MEDIA MEASURES IN
RXS." UNPUBLISHED STAFF MEMO, JULY 1985.

TRAUGOTT, SANTA. (1985) "ASSESSMENT OF MEDIA MEASURES IN
PRE-POST" UNPUBLISHED STAFF MEMO, JULY 1985.

TRAUGOTT, SANTA. (UNDATED) "THE POLITICAL INTEREST VARIABLE
ON THE 1984 ELECTION STUDY." UNPUBLISHED STAFF MEMO TO
NES PLANNING COMMITTEE.

TRAUGOTT, SANTA. (1985) "SOME ANALYSIS OF HARD-TO-REACH
ROLLING THUNDER RESPONDENTS." UNPUBLISHED STAFF MEMO TO
NES BOARD OF OVERSEERS, FEBRUARY 1985.

>> 1989 NES PILOT STUDY REPORTS

ABELSON, ROBERT. MESSAGE ON VOTE VALIDATION EXPERIMENT.

CALVO, MARIA ANTONIA AND STEVEN J. ROSENSTONE. THE
RE-FRAMING OF THE ABORTION DEBATE.

KINDER, DONALD R. AND THOMAS NELSON. EXPERIMENTAL
INVESTIGATIONS OF OPINION FRAMES AND SURVEY RESPONSES: A
REPORT TO THE NES BOARD.

KNIGHT, KATHLEEN. COMPARISONS OF LIBERAL-CONSERVATIVE ITEMS
IN THE ANES 1989 PILOT STUDY.

KROSNIK, JON AND MATTHEW K. BERENT. IMPACT OF VERBAL
LABELING ON RESPONSE ALTERNATIVES AND BRANCHING ON
ATTITUDE MEASUREMENT RELIABILITY.

LEEGER, DAVID, KEN WALD AND LYMAN KELLSTEDT. RELIGION AND
POLITICS. A REPORT ON MEASURES OF RELIGIOSITY IN THE 1989
NES PILOT STUDY.

MARKUS, GREGORY. MEASURING POPULAR INDIVIDUALISM.

NES STAFF. POSSIBLE BIAS DUE TO ATTRITION AND SAMPLE
SELECTION IN THE 1989 PILOT STUDY.

PRICE, VINCENT AND JOHN ZALLER. EVALUATION OF MEDIA EXPOSURE
ITEMS IN 1989.
APPENDIX 1: [PRICE & ZALLER] MEASURING INDIVIDUAL
DIFFERENCES...
APPENDIX 2: [ZALLER & PRICE] IN ONE EAR AND OUT THE
OTHER...

ROSENSTONE, STEVEN J. AND GREGORY A. DIAMOND. MEASURING
PUBLIC OPINION ON POLITICAL ISSUES.

TRAUGOTT, MICHAEL. MEMO TO PILOT STUDY COMMITTEE, INCLUDING
AS AN APPENDIX: UNDERSTANDING CAMPAIGN EFFECTS ON
CANDIDATE RECALL AND RECOGNITION.

ZALLER, JOHN. EXPERIMENTAL TESTS OF THE QUESTION ANSWERING MODEL OF THE MASS SURVEY RESPONSE.

>> CODEBOOK INFORMATION

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

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

Line

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

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

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

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

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

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

Line 7 - Actual question text for survey variables or a description of
non-survey variables (for example, congressional district). Survey items usually include the question number (for example "Bla.") from the Study questionnaire; beginning in 1996 non-survey items also have unique item numbers (for example "CSheet.1").

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

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

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

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