Methodology Report
for the
2006 ANES Pilot Study

Matthew DeBell
Jon A. Krosnick
Arthur Lupia
Pat Luevano
American National Election Studies
Stanford University and the University of Michigan

Methodology Report for the 2006 ANES Pilot Study

Contents

1. Introduction

The 2006 ANES Pilot Study was conducted for the purpose of testing new questions and conducting methodological research to inform the design of future ANES studies. This report documents the methods and procedures followed in the design and implementation of the study. The report describes the purpose of the Pilot Study and its place in the overall ANES project, the sample design, the process of questionnaire development, data collection procedures, data processing, response rates, weighting, and procedures for analysis.

This report is not a substitute for the Pilot Study's codebook, which describes each variable in the dataset.

1.1. Overview of ANES

The mission of the American National Election Studies (ANES) is to advance the scientific study of elections, specifically by helping scholars to understand voter turnout and vote choice. ANES informs explanations of election outcomes by providing data that support rich hypothesis testing, measure many variables, and promote comparisons across people, contexts, and time. The ANES serves this mission by providing researchers with a view of the political world through the eyes of ordinary citizens. Such data are critical, because these citizens' actions determine election outcomes.

Time Series studies are conducted around national elections, including every presidential election year since 1948. Time series studies in presidential election years are typically conducted both before and after the election (that is, a pre-election study and a post-election study). During years in which ANES has conducted a congressional election study, the study has typically been conducted only after the election (a post-election study). The most recent ANES congressional election study was conducted in 2002.

Pilot Studies have historically been conducted in the 'off-years' when there is no national election. The Pilot Study described in this report was conducted immediately following the 2006 election. Pilot Studies are designed to test new questions and conduct methodological research in order to improve other data collections.

The 2008-2009 ANES Panel Study will gather data repeatedly from the same respondents at several points in time spanning the 2008 presidential election season and the beginning of the 44th president's term.

Other major data collections have included ad hoc stand alone studies such as the Senate Election Studies and the 1982 Methods Comparison Study, as well as the panel studies which span individual Time Series studies.

1.2. Pilot Study Overview

The 2006 ANES Pilot Study was conducted for the purpose of testing new questions and conducting methodological research to inform the design of future ANES studies. Over the years, the ANES has used pilot studies to test new questions that can be included in later national surveys. Data from these studies have been very informative. Some have been used to convey substantive and methodological insights in widely-read publications, while others have served as the basis for technical reports that have directly improved subsequent ANES data collections.

Pilot Study at a glance

Title:	2006 ANES Pilot Study
Purpose:	To test new questions and conduct methodological research to inform the design of future ANES studies of vote choice and voter turnout. (The Pilot Study is not a study of the 2006 Congressional elections.)
Population:	The 2006 Pilot Study represents the population of individuals who were U.S. citizens age 18 or older as of election day in November of 2004.
Sample:	The eligible sample was all 1,211 individuals who completed a valid pre-election questionnaire in the 2004 ANES.
Mode:	Computer-aided telephone interviewing.
Field period:	November 13, 2006 through January 7, 2007.
Number of interviews:	675
Reinterview rate:	56 percent
Overall response rate:	37 percent
Average interview length:	37 minutes
Weight:	All analyses that generalize to the population should employ weights. The final weight variable in the 2006 data file is V06P002.
Significance testing:	Statistical significance testing should account for the complex sample design; see section 6.5.
Merging opportunity:	All 2006 Pilot Study respondents completed the pre-election wave of the 2004 ANES time series study. The two data sets can be merged for analysis.
How to get the data:	ANES data are available free of charge from the ANES web site: http://www.electionstudies.org

2. Study Design

The Pilot Study was conducted immediately following the November 2006 elections to permit the collection of data during a season comparable to the ANES time series studies, which include a post-election questionnaire administered in November after a national election. The Pilot Study was scheduled in 2006 to afford researchers sufficient time to analyze these data and apply their findings to the 2008-2009 ANES Panel Study and the 2008 Time Series Study.

The Pilot Study reinterviewed respondents from the 2004 ANES. Using this sample allowed ANES to provide data efficiently, as we already knew how to locate most of the respondents. It also provides a rich source of information against which to evaluate new questions and a broader base of evidence from which to make arguments about the future suitability of pilot study questions, as we already know a lot about these people as a result of interviewing them previously.

The content of the Pilot Study questionnaires was determined using a new Internet-based procedure, the ANES Online Commons, for soliciting, processing, reviewing, and providing feedback on proposals for study design elements from anyone who wished to contribute. The Online Commons is further described in section 3.1.

2.1. Population

The 2006 Pilot Study initial sample consisted of all 1,211 individuals who completed a valid interview in the 2004 ANES time series study (not to be confused with the 2004 ANES Panel Study). As such, the population represented by the 2006 Pilot Study is the same as the population represented by the 2004 time series study. This population is defined to include all United States citizens of voting age on or before the 2004 Election Day who resided in housing units in the forty-eight coterminous states. This definition excludes persons who lived in Alaska or Hawaii (or the District of Columbia or U.S. territories) in 2004 and requires eligible persons to have been both a United States citizen and eighteen years of age on or before the 2nd of November 2004.

2.2. Sample

The 2006 Pilot Study interviewed respondents to the pre-election wave of the 2004 ANES. This section describes the 2004 ANES sample in detail. It contains the same information previously published in the 2004 NES Codebook.

The 2004 ANES study's area sample is based on a multi-stage area probability sample selected from the University of Michigan Survey Research Center's (SRC) 1990 National Sample design. Identification of the 2004 ANES 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) and

non-MSA 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 1990 SRC National Sample, from which the 2004 NES sample was drawn, is provided in the SRC publication titled 1990 SRC National Sample: Design and Development (Heeringa et al. 1994).

The 2004 NES sample design called for an entirely new cross-section sample to be drawn from the 1990 SRC National Sample. The 1990 SRC National Sample is a multi-stage area probability sample. The 2004 NES sample was drawn from both the 1990 SRC National Sample strata (MSA PSUs) and the 1980 SRC National Sample strata (non-MSA PSUs). The modification of the 1990 design in which the 1980 strata definitions were used for the non-MSA counties fully represents the non-MSA domain of the 48 contiguous states. This modification was made for cost and interviewing efficiency reasons related to the availability of interviewers in these areas who work on some of SRC's large panel studies.

Selection Stages for the 2004 NES Sample: 1990 SRC National Sample: Primary Stage Selection

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. Primary stage units were assigned to 108 explicit strata based on MSA/NECMA or nonMSA/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 non-self-representing strata contain more than one PSU. From each of these non-self-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 2004 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 sub-selection from the full 108 PSU design. The 2004 ANES sample of 44 PSUs is a stratified random subsample of PSUs from the "A" half-sample partition of the 1990 SRC National Sample. Because of the small size of this ANES sample, both the number of PSUs (selected primary areas) and the secondary stage units (area segments) in the National half-sample were reduced by sub-selection for the 2004 ANES sample design.

The 18 self-representing areas in the 1990 SRC National half-sample were all retained for the 2004 ANES sample (8 of these remained self-representing in the 2004 ANES 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 nonself-representing half-sample MSAs and 7 of the 14 half-sample non-MSAs were retained by the sub-selection for the 2004 ANES sample (or 26 of 40 NSR PSUs).

Second Stage Selection of Area Segments

The second stage of the 1990 SRC National Sample, used for the 2004 ANES sample, 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 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).

For the 2004 ANES sample 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 12 area segments to a low of 6 area segments in smaller self-representing PSUs.

Third Stage Selection of Housing Units: 2004 ANES Sample

For each area segment selected in the second sampling stage, a listing had been 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 sub-selected part of the segment were listed. The final equal probability sample of housing units for the 2004 ANES sample was systematically selected from the housing unit listings for the sampled area segments.

The 2004 ANES sample design was selected from the 1990 SRC National Sample to yield an equal probability sample of 2,756 listed housing units. This total included 2,366 housing units for the main sample and three reserve replicates of 130 cases each. Table 1 below shows the assumptions that were used to determine the number of sample housing units. The overall probability of selection for 2004 NES cross-section sample of households was $f=0.00002575$ or 0.2575 in 10,000. The equal probability sample of households was achieved for the 2004 ANES sample by using the standard multistage 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 (Kish, 1965).

8

Fourth Stage Respondent Selection: 2004 ANES Sample

Within each sampled 2004 ANES occupied housing unit, the SRC interviewer prepared a complete listing of all eligible household members. A single respondent was then selected at random to be interviewed. Regardless of circumstances, no substitutions were permitted for the designated respondent.

Sample Design Assumptions, Specifications, and Outcomes

The 2004 American National Election Study sought a total of 1200 in-person interviews. It was estimated that this would require a sample draw of 2,366 housing units. This assumed an occupancy/growth rate of 0.83, an eligibility rate of 0.94 and a response rate of 0.65. These assumptions were based on the 2000 ANES field experience. The overall 2004 ANES area sample design specifications, assumptions and outcomes appear in Table 1, below. A sample of 2,756 listed housing units was actually selected for the 2004 ANES study. This allowed for three reserve replicates of 130 cases each. Use of half-open intervals in the field led to the addition of 8 additional lines. These were housing units that were not identified during the listing stage, but were located between the selected housing unit and the next unit on the original listing. The use of this procedure insures full coverage of housing units.

A comparison of the 2004 ANES sample outcome figures to the design specifications and assumptions in table 1 below shows that the actual occupancy, eligibility, and response rates were very close to the expected rates. This table shows figures from the 2004 ANES Codebook and thus shows 1,212 completions, though 1,211 were later determined to be eligible members of the sample.

Table 1.   2004 ANES area sample Pre- and Post-election sample design specifications and outcomes

Sample characteristic	Pre-election survey		Post-election survey	
	Design	Outcome	Design	Outcome
Total sample lines	2366	2374	—	—
Occupied households	1964	1886	—	—
Occupancy/growth rate	.83	.79	—	—
Eligible sample househollds	1946	1825	1200	1212
Eligibility rate	.94	.97	—	—
Completed interviews	1200	1212	1020	1066
Response rate[1]	.65	.66	.85	.88

[1] The response rates shown for the Post-election survey are reinterview rates.
— Not applicable.

3. Questionnaire Development

This chapter describes the process of developing the 2006 Pilot Study questionnaire, including the Online Commons used to solicit public input and specific proposals for questionnaire content, the proposal review process, cognitive interviewing, CATI instrument development, and pretesting.

3.1 Online Commons

The Online Commons is intended to help improve the process by which scholars around the world can shape how the American National Election Studies collect data. The vision for this process was, and remains, an open, public forum where anyone is free to propose content for ANES surveys and to comment upon proposals.

From March 8 to June 15, 2006, the first ever ANES Online Commons allowed interested persons to propose questions for the 2006 ANES Pilot Study. Over 300 scholars from a range of scientific disciplines registered for the Online Commons. Collectively, they responded to this new opportunity by proposing over 1100 questions – with many coming from younger faculty and graduate students and over one-third coming from disciplines outside political science. These proposals remain on the Online Commons (http://www.electionstudies.org/onlinecommons.htm).

The Online Commons was created with the expectation that the effectiveness of studies will be enhanced if they are based on sustained, constructive, and rigorous scholarly interactions about all aspects of questionnaire design and implementation. Many innovative ideas, from a range of scientific disciplines and perspectives, can be incorporated in ANES studies, and the Online Commons has been created to make such collaborations possible. The goal is to improve the quality and scientific value of each of our data collections, to encourage the submission of new ideas, and to make such experiences more beneficial to and enjoyable for individual investigators.

The Online Commons is open to anyone who wants to make constructive contributions to the design of ANES data collections. Any Internet user can view the Online Commons, but posting something may only be done by people who have registered for Online Commons membership. Learn how to register on the Online Commons registration page (http://www.electionstudies.org/onlinecommons.htm).

After registering, members may write proposals advocating the inclusion of new questions in the questionnaires or suggesting that we continue to ask questions that have been asked in the past or suggesting that particular questions not be asked again. Members are also eligible to post comments about each proposal, and proposal authors can update or revise their proposals in response to advice they receive.

The Online Commons facilitates an open, transparent, and constructive decision-making process for ANES. Design of the ANES has always involved public input, but with the

Online Commons, we can do so more openly than ever before, promoting public discussion about the suitability of particular questions before they are included in surveys.

General requirements announced for Pilot Study proposals, described on the ANES website, included the following:

- Exact wording of proposed question(s) (including for questions that have been asked in previous ANES surveys). (Please note that the primary mandate of ANES is to explain vote choices and turnout. However, this mandate can be advanced in many different ways that incorporate insights from many different disciplines or approaches.)

- An explicit argument about why the proposed question(s) merit inclusion in the ANES survey.

- An explicit argument about the kinds and range of statistical analyses that the question(s) allows and the benefit of such analyses to science (and society). Clear presentations of modeling frameworks, power statistics, or analogous analytic concepts will make arguments more persuasive.

- An explicit argument about the conceptual and theoretical foundations of the question(s).

- Evidence about the empirical performance of such questions. Such evidence will make a proposal much more persuasive.

- Evidence that the proposed way of asking the question(s) yields better data than obvious alternate ways of asking the same question(s).

- If the proposal advocates asking a question that ANES has asked in the past, the proposal will be more persuasive if it includes explicit evidence about the breadth and depth of the question's previous usage and impact in the scholarly literature. Do not assume that readers already know about prior uses of the questions or will research prior uses on their own.

- Five keywords that we can use to identify the proposal in a search algorithm.

3.2 Proposal Review

Evaluation of proposals had three steps. First, after the Online Commons (OC) proposal period closed, the ANES Principal Investigators (PIs) assigned every proposal to a subcommittee of the Board of Overseers. The subcommittees then prepared reports that

they shared with the rest of the Board and the PIs. Second, the Board and the PIs met for two days at Stanford University in late July, 2006. There we discussed how to develop a Pilot Study that would be of maximum value to the growing ANES user community. Each proposal was discussed at the meeting. Third, the PIs took all of the information and then worked to assemble the set of proposals that best fit the Pilot Study criteria. They began contacting the authors of these proposals in late August and formally announced the list of winning proposals at a special panel at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association in Philadelphia on September 2, 2006. At the same time, the PIs prepared individualized and detailed responses to the authors of all of the other proposals. These responses thanked scholars for their contributions for the project and provided feedback and attempted to build on the content of these proposals so that the ideas might be of greater use to ANES and other studies in the future.

Given the Pilot Study's goal of evaluating new questions, there were several kinds of proposals on which the PIs could not act. For example, some proposals asked ANES to be sure to run certain questions from past ANES surveys in 2006. Given the mandate of the Pilot Study to test new content, we could not accommodate these requests. Others asked to run questions which have already appeared on other major surveys. Since our mandate was to evaluate new questions – principally questions that had never before appeared on nationally representative surveys – we did not act on these requests either. Finally, some proposals described new questions that lacked an apparent connection to determinants of turnout and vote choice.

Otherwise, evaluation centered on the following seven criteria.

> 1) *Novelty of Idea*: Are the ideas in the proposal new, either for the study of elections or for another social science enterprise or both? If so, are they directly relevant to the mission of the ANES (i.e., understanding the causes or consequences of voter turnout or candidate choice)? Most of the proposals we received satisfied this criterion.
>
> 2) *Building on Solid Theoretical Footing*: Do the ideas in this proposal follow from strong, convincing theory about how people are likely to think and/or act? Given ANES's mandate to serve a broad user community, it is important that users be able to understand, and explain to others, the theoretical rationale for including particular concepts and questions on an ANES survey. Concepts should be defended as part of a set of cause-and-effect relationships that ultimately have the potential (alone or with other factors) to have a significant impact on vote choice or turnout. Given the temporal element of the ANES Time Series (and our new panel study), time is one of the "other factors" that is useful to name. Regarding the questions that represent the concepts, it is important to think about the quality of the data that questions will provide. Quality, in turn, is a function of wording. If we ask a question that a nationally representative set of respondents understands in the same way, then the data have greater value in analyses that depend on comparing responses. Many questions, however, either confuse respondents or are asked in ways that should undermine an analyst's confidence

in the comparability of responses. Much of the feedback that we offered to OC proposers was in the spirit of working with them to arrive at more effective theoretical arguments about the relevance and role of particular concepts and questions.

3) *Building on a Solid Empirical Foundation*: Have the ideas advocated in the proposal been empirically tested and supported by past research? For some proposals, it was helpful for us to see that focal concepts had been evaluated in a laboratory setting or on other surveys that were credible, but not directly comparable to the ANES. This kind of evidence was particularly valuable

4) *Breadth of Relevance and Generalizability*: Will the ideas being advocated be interesting, and/or provocative, and/or counter-intuitive to many scholars? Most of the proposals we received satisfied this criterion. There were some cases where some very good ideas were proposed – but ultimately they were ideas that would serve a very narrow range of research hypotheses. While we're excited to see such research unfold, it is difficult to justify placing such items on the ANES when the opportunity cost is excluding questions that are just as interesting, but would have far broader value to users.

5) *Suitability to ANES*: What kinds of statistical analyses would be required to make the most of the proposed questions, and can these analyses be conducted with the array of measures that will be available to analysts of the pilot study data? This criterion is critically important as most ANES users draw inferences from the data using statistics. This criterion played a focal role in our decisions not to act on some very good ideas that would likely produce some very unusable data. For example, a few proposals featured questions for which it was unlikely that more than a handful of respondents would say "yes." While such frequencies can be valuable to know, they severely limit the usefulness of such variables to most ANES users. Of course, for people with temporal hypotheses, having no one say "yes" at a certain time can be quite informative – and we are willing to consider proposals where such outcomes are possible. But we would encounter problems if such null results were expected most or every time the question would be run.

6) *Bridge-Building*: Can the ideas proposed build intellectual bridges from one or more research traditions to others? There is no single approach to explaining turnout or vote choice. Where possible, however, we would like to challenge researchers within certain paradigms to explore the consequences of interacting with other scientific communities. We received several proposals that brought ideas from outside traditional ways of looking at elections into the context in exciting and potentially path-breaking ways. Subject to such proposals meeting the other stated criteria, we'd like to see more of this.

7) *Controversy-Relevant*: Are the ideas proposed relevant to ongoing controversies among researchers, such that our adding particular questions can advance the debate?

Review of OC proposals identified 29 proposals that were selected to be the basis for the Pilot Study questionnaire. The abundance of proposals resulted in pressure to compact the size of the questionnaire. Following the selection of winning OC proposals, the ANES Principal Investigators and senior staff corresponded with winning proposal authors to refine their proposed questions and to reduce the number of items to fit within the available space on the questionnaire. Nearly all proposals were revised in this way.

3.3. Cognitive Interviewing

Cognitive interviewing is a method of questionnaire testing in which members of the general public are recruited to complete a questionnaire and to provide feedback to the interviewer about the questionnaire. Its purpose is to make sure that the survey questions measure what they are intended to measure and that respondents can understand and respond to the questions without undue difficulty. Problems identified during cognitive interviewing can then be rectified in light of the respondents' feedback about the questions. For a review of cognitive interviewing practices, see Beatty and Willis (2007).

Cognitive interviews indicate what the participant thinks the question is asking, what kinds of things the participant thinks about when answering the question, the amount of effort the question requires, and the appropriateness of a question's response options. Cognitive interviewing can reveal that vocabulary used in questions is confusing or ambiguous, that information solicited in questions is difficult to remember accurately, and that respondents interpret questions differently than question writers intend the questions.

ANES staff conducted 20 cognitive interviews in the first half of October, 2006. Participants were a convenience sample recruited through classified advertisements placed in the print editions of the Los Angeles Times and the Dallas Morning News, and online on www.fogster.com and www.craigslist.org. The print advertisements offered $40 to participate in a one-hour telephone interview. Online advertisements were local to the San Francisco Bay Area and offered $100 for a one-hour interview on campus at Stanford University. Eight interviews were conducted in person and 12 by telephone. Each interview lasted approximately 1 hour. Each interview was tape recorded on digital audio tape (DAT) with the participant's permission.

In these interviews, we asked respondents to think aloud as they interpreted each question and generated each answer, so that we could gain insight into the interpretive processes that naturally unfold. To do this, we asked respondents to restate the meaning of each question in their own words before answering it, and then we encouraged respondents to

think aloud and verbalize all the thoughts they had as they generated their answers to a question. The relevant instruction was as follows:

> After you hear each question, first please restate the question in your own words. We want to learn about how you interpret the questions I will ask you, and one good way to do that is for us to see how you restate the ideas in the question but using <u>different</u> words that express the same meaning to you.

> Second, we'd like to learn about how you come up with your answer to each question. To learn about how you're thinking, after you restate the meaning of each question, please say out loud as many of your thoughts as you can while you are thinking about how to answer each question.

To enhance participant performance at these tasks, the interviewer had each participant perform a warm-up practice exercise of thinking out loud at the start of the interview. The full script used for this task appears in Appendix A of this report. The participant practiced the exercise with the question, "How many windows are there in your home?" Respondents restated this question in different words (e.g., "What is the number of glassed openings that you can look through in the place where I live?"). Almost no respondent has the answer to this question already stored in his or her long-term memory, so this is a nice question to use, because respondents realize they must go through a step-by-step thought process to generate their answers. This means that there is a slowly-executed cognitive process that can be verbalized. Respondents usually got comfortable with this after a little coaching.

This question is an excellent way to prepare a respondent to use his or her own words to restate each question. "How many windows are there in your home?" is a very simple question. In most cases, respondents initially repeat the question back to the interviewer changing little or none of the question text. This gives the interviewer an opportunity to point out to the respondent that every question must be restated using completely different words. Beginning the exercise with such a simple question makes it easier for respondents to restate more complex questions later in the interview.

During each interview, participants routinely needed to be helped through the process with verbal probes (such as "Can you tell me more about that?"), reminders to rephrase each question ("In your own words, what is that question asking you?"), and silent probing, in which the interviewer simply waits patiently for the participant to say more. At in-person interviews, each participant was also handed a sheet of paper with two questions in very large (32-point) type:

1) Restate the question in your own words.
2) Think out loud as you generate your answer.

To encourage participants to be thoughtful, the cognitive interviewing had a *very* slow pace. The following text took the interviewer about one minute and 45 seconds to read aloud:

"One last thing I want to tell you is this: It is very important that you think carefully about each question and give me accurate and complete information. There may be some cases when you don't know the exact answer to a question. When this happens, it would be most helpful if you would tell me you're unsure and tell me what you're unsure about. Then, it would be best for you to generate your best guess of the answer and tell me about how you came up with that answer. Feel free to take as much time as you need to think about each question, and if it would be helpful to you, I can reread any question to you again if you like."

At this pace, each hour-long interview provided sufficient time to complete about one third of the pretest questionnaire.

Cognitive interviewing produced useful feedback about many questions and led to several revisions before the pretest. The following are examples of ideas that emerged from the cognitive interviews:

- Item Mod11_1 in the pretest questionnaire asked if Jesus Christ "was" the son of God. At least two people replied that he "is" the son of God, so we changed this wording to the present tense.

- In response to "How much of the time can you trust other people?" we observed that people often thought about frequency. Therefore, we added two other questions (Mod6_A2 and Mod6_A3): "What percent of people can you trust all of the time?" and "What percent of people can you never trust at all?"

- People thought about success in quite different ways. We decided to add follow-up questions (Mod7_B11 and Mod7_B12) that asked about two different kinds of success separately: financial success and success at getting other people's respect and admiration for accomplishments.

- Item Mod15_5 was initially worded to ask "How conflicted…" Cognitive interview participants did not seem to understand the word "conflicted." We changed this to "How conflicting…"

- We revised the news media questions (Module 18) by adding the words, "not including sports," after it became clear that sports news accounted for much of the time being reported.

- Items Mod21_A and Mod21_B. As a result of cognitive interviewing, we specified that the book criticizes the United States.

- We added an introduction to Module 22 to reduce respondent confusion, explaining that we would ask about four different groups being treated fairly or unfairly by the police.

- We observed that cognitive interview participants had difficulty with questions asking about the percentage distribution of public support for particular policies. We later deleted these items from the questionnaire, following the pretest described below, when it was clear that many respondents became frustrated and could not report percentage distributions that summed to 100 percent.

3.4. Pretest

SRBI conducted a telephone pre-test of the questionnaire on October 23-24, 2006, with 30 adults age 18 or older recruited through random-digit dialing. The purpose of the pretest was to test study procedures, the questionnaire instrument, and interviewer training prior to the data collection, and to obtain timing estimates.

The average length of the pretest interviews was 55 minutes. The Pilot Study data collection contract and budget permitted an average interview length of less than 45 minutes, necessitating cuts to the questionnaire. Following the pretest, we reduced the number of items in the network battery, reduced the number of people about whom the network items would be asked, changed the abortion item to ask each respondent a randomized subsample of these questions, and, in many sections, reduced the number of questions asked.

Pretest interviews were extensively monitored by ANES staff. During monitoring, staff remotely listened to the telephone calls and observed what was displayed on the interviewer's CATI computer screen in real time. Monitoring is an indispensable way for survey staff to assess the soundness of the data collection process, including the respondents' ability to understand the questions, the effectiveness of interviewer training and instructions, and the proper operation of the CATI software. Respondents were not aware that this monitoring was taking place. Interviewers were aware that monitoring was regularly performed, but they usually did not know which interviews were being monitored unless a supervisor coached them during the interview. As a result, monitoring also served to deter and detect the fabrication of data by interviewers.

Following the pretest, debriefing sessions were held with the interviewers to collect their feedback. These sessions were conducted on-site at SRBI's interviewing facility with the ANES study director in attendance. Interviewer feedback was invaluable because interviewers reported difficulties they experienced with the CATI system as well as difficulties they observed respondents having with the questions.

After the pretest, several revisions were made to the questionnaire based on monitoring and interviewer feedback. These included slight changes to question wording and response options, as well as the deletion of a section of the questionnaire (asking about the percentage distribution of public support for particular policies) because many respondents could not report percentage distributions that summed to 100 percent.

3.5. Instrument Programming and Testing

The Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) system employed for the study was SPSS Quancept. ANES delivered questionnaire specifications to the data collection firm, SRBI, Inc, and ANES and SRBI teams worked jointly to test the CATI program to assure its consistency with program specifications. This testing included the following:

- Text checks assured that CATI question text exactly matched the questionnaire specifications.
- Skip checks assured that each respondent would receive the appropriate questions in the appropriate sequence.
- Range checks assure that that all appropriate responses are accepted and inappropriate responses (such as text responses in numeric fields, or frequencies of 8 days per week) are not accepted.
- Functionality and usability testing assured that the CATI software was free of program bugs and interviewers would not encounter difficulties with the software.

After testing by staff, SRBI ran an autopilot program to test the software. This program tests the interview program by simulating a specified number of interviews and randomly generating a response to each question. Analysis of the resulting dataset can identify programming errors.

3.6. Fielded Instrument

Instrument Versions

The final CATI instrument had three versions, each with identical substantive questions but differing in minor aspects of technical implementation for administrative purposes. These were (1) the main instrument, (2) the cellular phone version of the instrument, and (3) the refusal conversion instrument. The main instrument was used in the bulk of cases (n=583). A separate cellular phone version was required because the main instrument employed an autodialer, while it is unlawful to use autodialer equipment to call cellular phones in the United States. The refusal conversion instrument was used by specially trained refusal conversion interviewers who placed calls to sample members previously assigned a refusal disposition. The questions, consent scripts, and confirmation of respondent identity were the same in each version. The version of the instrument used for each interview is identified in the variable V06P208.

The Pilot Study employed an autodialer for landline telephones. An autodialer dials the telephone for the interviewer automatically, saving a small amount of labor with no effect on the respondent. The autodialier is to be distinguished from a predictive dialer, which was not used. A predictive dialer dials more telephone numbers at once than there are interviewers available and then matches answered calls to the first available interviewer. Predictive dialers can significantly reduce the amount of time that interviewers spend listening to phones ringing, thus increasing interviewer productivity. However, the call-to-interviewer match imposes a brief delay as the respondent is met with silence on the

telephone. Predictive dialers are frequently used by telemarketers, may irritate respondents, and give respondents an opportunity to hang up the phone before the interviewer comes on the line. These disadvantages generally make predictive dialers inappropriate for use in survey research.

Questionnaire Content

The fielded instrument had an opening sequence, 29 substantive modules, and a section for interviewer observations about the interview. The opening sequence included questions to confirm the identity of the sampled respondent, an informed consent script, and the incentive offer. The substantive modules and interviewer observation sections contained the questions selected to fulfill the Pilot Study's purpose of question testing and methodological research to inform future ANES study development.

The questionnaire modules were as follows:

1. *Character Judgments*. A single question asked, "First, how much do you think people can change the kind of person they are?"
2. *Defensive Confidence*. A single question asked, "If you wanted to defend an opinion of yours, how successfully do think you could do that?"
3. *Need for Closure*. A short battery measured need for closure.
4. *Belief in a Just World*. A single question asked, "How much of the time do people get what they deserve in life?"
5. *Self Monitoring*. Respondents were randomly assigned to be asked one of two versions of this three-item battery to measure self-monitoring.
6. *Trust*. Respondents were randomly assigned to be asked one of two versions of this battery measuring interpersonal trust.
7. *Values*. Two versions of a ten-item set of questions about values were tested.
8. *Borrowing*. Respondents were asked if they could borrow money if they really needed to, and how much.
9. *Sociotropic Voting*. Respondents were asked to guess the unemployment rate and the average price of a gallon of gasoline, and to report how much they drive and how often they notice the price of gasoline.
10. *Religion*. This section contains questions about the importance of religion and the frequency of religious service attendance.
11. *Christianity*. Respondents who reported being a Christian during the 2004 ANES interview were asked questions about their Christian beliefs and experience.
12. *Optimism/Pessimism*. An experiment compares two versions of questions about the respondent's optimism or pessimism about their own future and the future of the United States.
13. *Social Networks*. A series of questions asked who the respondent talks to about "government and elections" or about "important" subjects.
14. *Attention to Politics*. Questions in this section asked how interested the respondent is in government and politics and how much attention the respondent paid to the subject.

15. *Ambivalence*. Respondents were separately asked about their favorable feelings toward government and their unfavorable feelings toward government.
16. *Efficacy*. This section contains an experiment to compare traditional ANES efficacy questions in an agree-disagree format to new versions. It also contains questions about the ability of Congress and the President to affect the country and the respondent.
17. *Trust in Government*. Several new questions measuring trust in government were tested.
18. *Media*. Respondents reported the number of days per week and the number of hours per day they watched, read, or listed to news using various media.
19. *Party Identification*. Two versions of party identification questions were tested.
20. *Abortion*. This series of questions asked about several specific reasons for obtaining an abortion and asked about the timing of the abortion during the pregnancy.
21. *Tolerance*. Respondents were randomly assigned to receive one of two versions of a political tolerance question about removing a book from a library.
22. *Justice*. These questions asked about fair treatment of criminal suspects by the police.
23. *Gender*. Several questions asked about respondents' judgments of male and female politicians.
24. *Tax*. Three questions concerned opinion about estate taxes and about progressive taxation of individuals and businesses.
25. *Partisan Differences*. Questions concerned similarities and differences between Democrats and Republicans.
26. *Voting*. Respondents reported 2006 turnout and voting behavior, as well as their choice in a hypothetical election between Bill Clinton and George W. Bush.
27. *Branching Questions on Presidential Approval*. Presidential approval questions were asked with an experiment to compare two approaches to branching follow-up questions about approval and disapproval.
28. *Economy*. One question asked, "Now thinking about the economy in the country as a whole, would you say that over the past year, the nation's economy has gotten better, stayed about the same, or gotten worse?"
29. *Death*. Two questions asked how upsetting it is to think about the possibility of your own death and how likely it is that a majority of all people on Earth will die at once during the next 100 years because of a single event.

Demographic and other background questions were not included in this questionnaire because the respondents previously reported this information in the 2004 ANES. Analysts who wish to incorporate these data in their analyses should merge the Pilot Study data with the 2004 ANES data.

CATI Interface

The CATI instrument was programmed in SPSS Quancept. Exhibits 1 through 4 present screenshots for illustrative purposes, showing key features of the instrument as it was employed by interviewers.

Exhibit 1 shows the first contact screen for the Pilot Study, displayed if someone answered the interviewer's telephone call. This screenshot is of the instrument in testing mode; in live mode for data collection, the text "test1" was replaced by the interviewer's first and last name, and the text "name" was replaced by the prospective respondent's first and last name.

Typical of other CATI screens for the Pilot Study, the screen in Exhibit 1 shows an item label at the top of the screen ("INTRO1"), followed by question text that was read to the respondent, with response options below the question text in all caps. Notes to the interviewer appear below the response options. The interviewer typed responses on a keyboard, and the response was displayed at the bottom of the screen before the interviewer continued to the next question.

The screen shown in Exhibit 1 is atypical of most screens one respect, in that no response options were read aloud to the respondent from this screen. Exhibits 2 and 3 show screens where response options were read aloud. Exhibit 2 shows the item confirming the state of the respondent's residence. Exhibit 3 shows the first question from Module 1.

In addition to the options read to the respondent, Exhibit 3 shows two additional options, "(VOL) DON'T KNOW" and "(VOL) REFUSED." These were entered only if the respondent volunteered them. Most CATI screens for the Pilot Study were similar the screen in Exhibit 3.

Exhibit 4 illustrates the screen used to record names in the social networks section (Module 13). Interviewers typed the initials or names of up to 10 people with whom the respondent discussed "important" subjects or politics and government.

The programming specifications for the CATI instrument are in Appendix B. The CATI program code for main questionnaire runs over 1,000 pages and is presented in a separate document, the *CATI Program Code Annex to the Methodology Report for the 2006 ANES Pilot Study*, available on the ANES website (www.electionstudies.org).

Exhibit 1. CATI screenshot of the first contact screen of the 2006 ANES Pilot Study.

```
2/INTRO1

INTRO1. Hi, my name is test1, and I am calling from SRBI on behalf of the
University of Michigan and Stanford University. Can I speak with |name
                        please?

  1 R SPEAKING
  2 R AVAILABLE
  3 R NOT AVAILABLE NOW
  4 NO ONE HERE BY THAT NAME

Reply may not be NULL or DK or REF
 .. Reply may be one of the above

Response: █
```

Exhibit 2. CATI screenshot of residence state confirmation question from the opening sequence of the 2006 ANES Pilot Study.

```
5/QSTATE

STATE. And just to confirm, are you still living in Arkansas
 , or are you living in a different state?

  1 STILL LIVING IN STATE
  2 DIFFERENT STATE

Reply may not be NULL or DK or REF
 .. Reply may be one of the above

Response:
```

Exhibit 3. CATI screenshot of the first question of the 2006 ANES Pilot Study.

```
6/Q21310

Q2-13-10. First, how much do you think people can change the kind of person they
are?  Completely, a lot, a moderate amount, a little, or not at all?

  1 COMPLETELY
  2 A LOT
  3 A MODERATE AMOUNT
  4 A LITTLE
  5 NOT AT ALL
  8 (VOL) DON'T KNOW
  9 (VOL) REFUSED

Reply may not be NULL or DK or REF
 .. Reply may be one of the above

Response:
```

Exhibit 4. CATI screenshot of the social networks name generator from the 2006 ANES
Pilot Study.

```
57/QNET15

NAME 1  : _      NAME 6  :
NAME 2  :        NAME 7  :
NAME 3  :        NAME 8  :
NAME 4  :        NAME 9  :
NAME 5  :        NAME 10 :

[RECORD UP TO 10 NAMES] [INTERVIEWER, DO NOT ENTER TWO IDENTICAL NAMES.  IF THE
SAME NAME IS OFFERED TWICE, PROBE: "You gave the same name / initials twice.  If
you meant to refer to a different person the second time, please give that
person a different name or initial.". AFTER EACH NAME, PROBE, "Who else?" UNTIL
UNPRODUCTIVE OR THREE NAMES ARE ENTERED.]

  1 Gave response                        9 (VOL) REFUSED
  8 (VOL) Don't Know/No one/No one else

Reply may not be NULL or DK or REF
 .. Reply may be one of the above

Response:

Please enter a response
```

4. Data Collection

Data collection began on November 13, 2006, shortly after the November election, and ended on January 7, 2007. Data collection was conducted entirely on the telephone by Schulman, Ronca & Bucuvalas, Inc. (SRBI; now Abt SRBI; http://www.srbi.com/) using CATI instrumentation and interviewers stationed in Fort Myers, Florida. The data collection was overseen by ANES staff at Stanford University with assistance from staff at the University of Michigan.

4.1. Sample Tracing Efforts

ANES provided SRBI with the confidential database including the name and the contact information for each person who completed the 2004 ANES (initial n=1,212, later reduced to 1,211 after a problem with the integrity of one case was identified). Contact information included an address and telephone number in nearly all cases and in most cases included an alternative telephone number and contact information for a person who would know where to locate the respondent. These data were provided by the respondent during the 2004 time series interview. No updates of contact information had been conducted in the intervening two years since the 2004 study. Prior to interviewing, SRBI ran respondent data through a LexisNexis Best Name & Address search and Telematch reverse directory telephone lookup to obtain more up-to-date contact information. The LexisNexis service gathers current name and address data matched to name and address history for much of the U.S. population, allowing out-of-date contact information to be made current in some cases. Telematch provides mailing addresses associated with telephone numbers.

All phone numbers in the database were run through Telcordia and Neustar cell phone databases to identify cell phone numbers. A version of CATI for use with cellular phones was created for the 99 cases where the most recent phone number was a cell phone. This was required so that cell phone numbers could be dialed by hand, as the use of autodialers to call cell phones was illegal in the United States.

After all sample members were initially called at the respondent's most recent known telephone number, cases with bad numbers (that is, a wrong number or a number disconnected or not in service) were replaced with alternate phone numbers from the database or from Telematch. If the alternate phone numbers were also incorrect, then SRBI searched for listed numbers on Internet telephone directories. When this was unsuccessful, SRBI called respondent contacts listed in the ANES database. If these measures did not yield contact with the respondent's household, cases were sent to Choicepoint (a firm that was spun off from the Equifax credit reporting firm and maintains large databases on members of the American public) for advanced database lookup for possible additional up-to-date phone numbers, address information, or both. If there were still no results then the names of contacts who were previously called but had bad phone numbers were sent to Choicepoint and were subsequently called if alternate phone numbers were found for those contacts. Also, respondents with only a fax number

were faxed a brief letter (see Appendix C) asking for verification that the fax number belonged to them and requesting that they call the SRBI project director.

4.2. Interviewer Training

Experienced telephone interviewers were assigned to study-specific training sessions for the ANES Pilot Study. The first of these training sessions occurred immediately before the pretest interviewing on October 23, 2006, at SRBI's call center in Ft. Myers, Florida. Training was led by SRBI staff with ANES staff present. This introductory training lasted about two hours and consisted of instructing the interviewers on the purpose of the study, a group role-playing session in which interviewers practiced administering the questionnaire and received feedback from supervisors and ANES staff, and interviewer practice answering frequently asked questions.

Training for the main study occurred on November 7, 2006, lasted about three hours, and followed the same procedure as the pretest training. This was a study-specific training; these interviewers were already trained and experienced in conducting CATI surveys. Most interviewers who worked on the study had previously attended the pretest training and conducted pretest interviews. Interviewer training materials and handouts are shown in Appendix D. A total of 21 interviewers conducted interviews in the main study.

Several weeks after interviewing began, a refusal conversion training was conducted with selected interviewers prior to calling respondents who had previously declined to complete an interview and were sent a special 'refusal conversion' letter. (See Appendix C.)

4.3. Contact Procedures and Incentives

Shortly before the 2006 Pilot Study field period began on November 13, advance letters were sent to the sample members by USPS Priority Mail. Advance letters help to increase response rates (de Leeuw et al., 2007). The letters stated the purpose of the study and noted that a monetary incentive would be paid for participation. Most respondents had been paid $20 for participation in 2004, while others were paid $50 if they declined the $20 offer. Respondents in 2006 were initially offered the largest amount they had been offered in 2004. The advance letter contained a $2 bill and included a toll-free number to call to complete an interview. 179 advance letters were returned by the postal service as undeliverable.

Telephone calls were made at varying times of day (from 10am until 9pm in the respondent's time zone, unless the respondent scheduled an appointment outside those hours) and on multiple days of the week in order to increase the chances of reaching a respondent when he or she was home. No limit was placed on the number of times a household could be called, and many households were called dozens of times during the field period. In all, 22,727 dial attempts were made during the study, for an average of

25

33.7 calls per completed interview and 18.8 calls per sample member. At the first opportunity to do so, interviewers left the following answering machine message:

> Hello, my name is [first and last name] and I am calling from SRBI on behalf of the University of Michigan and Stanford University. I am calling to conduct a follow-up interview to 2004 American National Election Study survey. We recently sent you a letter letting you know that we're hoping to speak with you one last time. As before, we will send you $20 for participating in this survey.
>
> Please call us back as soon as possible at [toll-free number]. When you call you will need a PIN number to access the study. Your PIN is [read QKEY#]. Thank you.

Respondents who were not reached by phone in November were sent a second letter on or about December 1. Those who refused to be interviewed in November (n=151) were sent persuasion letters with an incentive offer of $50 on or about December 1. Persuasion letters were tailored to reasons that respondents gave for refusing, such as a general lack of interest, having no interest in politics, being too busy, concerns about confidentiality, or telling the interviewer not to call back.

Every sample member for whom we had an address and who had not completed an interview by mid-December was sent a final persuasion letter by FedEx, featuring a $100 incentive offer, on December 15. There were two versions of this letter, one for sample members who we had never reached, and one for those to whom an interviewer had spoken at least once.

All letters were printed on ANES stationery and hand-signed by SRBI staff in the name of ANES personnel. All but the final letter bore the signatures of both principal investigators; the final letter bore the signature of the ANES Director of Stanford Operations. All letters appear in Appendix C.

ANES paid incentives of $20 to 411 respondents, $50 to 136 respondents, and $100 to 128 respondents. Payments are indicated in variable V06P217.

4.4. Don't Know Probes

Except in the uncommon event that "Don't know" has been included in question text with other response options read to the respondent, "Don't know" and "Refused" traditionally have been considered by ANES to be volunteered responses only.

In the 2006 Pilot Study, interviewers followed a new protocol whenever a respondent gave an initial "don't know" (DK) response. The interviewer waited silently for approximately four seconds and then probed as follows: "I'll make a note of that. It would be a big help to us if you'd be willing to give me your best guess." The

interviewer then repeated the question and coded the respondent's answer. Consistent with standard practice of not recording when probes are used, there is no record of the individual instances of this probe's use. If respondents repeated the DK response after this probe, the DK answer was recorded.

4.5. Monitoring and Audio Recording

As occurred during pretesting (see section 3.4), interviewing was periodically monitored by ANES staff throughout the field period.

A sample of 53 interviews (8 percent of completions) was selected for digital audio recording with the respondent's consent. The recording serves a purpose similar to live interview monitoring—it is a valuable way for survey staff to assess the respondents' ability to understand the questions, the effectiveness of interviewer training and instructions, and the proper operation of the CATI software—but preserves the evidence for posterity. The imperative to protect respondents from disclosure risk prevents releasing these audio files to researchers.

4.6. Fieldwork Timeline

Data collection began on November 13, 2006, and concluded on January 7, 2007. The number of completed interviews, number of interviewer-hours worked, and number of interviewers working on each day of the field period are shown in Table 2.

As described above in section 4.3, advance letters were sent before data collection began, and additional letters were sent during the field period.

Throughout the field period, ANES and SRBI project staff regularly monitored sample disposition reports, call histories, timing reports, interviewer hours, and interim datasets. Review of interim datasets focused on quality control, discussed in section 5.1, below. Review of disposition reports and other metadata focused on response rates. Decisions about the timing of the persuasion letters and the amount of the final ($100) offer were based in part on the interim response rates observed during data collection. Interviewing ended on January 7 when it became clear that continued interviewing attempts were unproductive.

On January 12, 2007, ANES issued an Advance Release dataset containing the 665 interviews completed by December 26, 2006. Ten additional interviews completed after December 26 were added in the Full Release dataset, issued on April 26, 2007.

Table 2. 2006 ANES Pilot Study interview completions, interviewer hours, and number of interviewers working on each day of data collection

Field day	Date	Completions		Interviewer hours		Number of interviewers	Notes
		Daily	Cumulative	Daily	Cumulative		
1	11/13/2006	42	42	40.00	40.00	9	
2	11/14/2006	32	74	34.25	74.25	6	
3	11/15/2006	38	112	41.75	116.00	8	
4	11/16/2006	50	162	54.00	170.00	12	
5	11/17/2006	39	201	45.00	215.00	9	
6	11/18/2006	24	225	39.75	254.75	8	
7	11/19/2006	18	243	28.50	283.25	4	
8	11/20/2006	37	280	37.00	320.25	5	
9	11/21/2006	37	317	80.25	400.50	12	
10	11/22/2006	13	330	43.80	444.30	13	
11	11/23/2006	0	330	0.00	444.30	0	holiday
12	11/24/2006	0	330	0.00	444.30	0	holiday
13	11/25/2006	23	353	71.38	515.68	14	
14	11/26/2006	19	372	48.57	564.25	11	
15	11/27/2006	17	389	38.25	602.50	8	
16	11/28/2006	18	407	27.00	629.50	9	
17	11/29/2006	15	422	21.50	651.00	4	
18	11/30/2006	6	428	19.25	670.25	7	
19	12/1/2006	9	437	20.25	690.50	6	
20	12/2/2006	13	450	37.25	727.75	6	
21	12/3/2006	8	458	18.50	746.25	5	
22	12/4/2006	9	467	17.00	763.25	5	
23	12/5/2006	11	478	22.00	785.25	6	
24	12/6/2006	9	487	23.75	809.00	6	
25	12/7/2006	9	496	18.00	827.00	8	
26	12/8/2006	10	506	30.32	857.32	9	
27	12/9/2006	5	511	15.26	872.58	5	
28	12/10/2006	6	517	13.92	886.50	4	
29	12/11/2006	10	527	16.75	903.25	6	
30	12/12/2006	6	533	36.00	939.25	12	
31	12/13/2006	5	538	25.00	964.25	7	
32	12/14/2006	9	547	26.75	991.00	5	
33	12/15/2006	2	549	21.00	1012.00	5	
34	12/16/2006	10	559	13.50	1025.50	3	
35	12/17/2006	9	568	33.25	1058.75	8	
36	12/18/2006	24	592	30.75	1089.50	6	
37	12/19/2006	26	618	31.76	1121.26	8	
38	12/20/2006	15	633	23.50	1144.76	5	
39	12/21/2006	18	651	25.75	1170.51	6	
40	12/22/2006	12	663	19.00	1189.51	3	
41	12/23/2006	1	664	12.00	1201.51	2	
42	12/24/2006	0	664	0.00	1201.51	0	holiday
43	12/25/2006	0	664	0.00	1201.51	0	holiday
44	12/26/2006	1	665	9.75	1211.26	3	
45	12/27/2006	0	665	0.00	1211.26	0	no dialing
46	12/28/2006	1	666	0.75	1212.01	1	no dialing
47	12/29/2006	0	666	0.00	1212.01	0	no dialing
48	12/30/2006	0	666	0.00	1212.01	0	holiday
49	12/31/2006	0	666	0.00	1212.01	0	holiday
50	1/1/2007	0	666	0.00	1212.01	0	holiday
51	1/2/2007	0	666	0.00	1212.01	0	no dialing
52	1/3/2007	5	671	14.25	1226.26	2	
53	1/4/2007	3	674	3.75	1230.01	1	
54	1/5/2007	1	675	5.00	1235.01	2	
55	1/6/2007	0	675	2.25	1237.26	1	
56	1/7/2007	0	675	4.75	1242.01	2	

Source: 2006 ANES Pilot Study

5. Data Processing

This chapter describes data cleaning and quality control procedures followed during and after data collection, the creation of administrative and derived variables, and coding.

5.1. Cleaning and Quality Control

Data quality control was a labor-intensive process repeated continuously throughout data collection. Its main purpose was to assure that the CATI questionnaire was working correctly. Quality control checks included the verifying following throughout and after data collection:

- No IDs were duplicated.
- Skip instructions were followed correctly.
- Randomization appeared to have been successful; values for each random variable had a plausible distribution.
- No data were out of range (that is, all numeric data with limited legitimate ranges were within those ranges, such as days per week being integers from 0 through 7).
- Frequency distributions were not anomalous.
- Rates of item nonresponse were not unusually high or low.
- Respondents who reported having voted were asked who they voted for, and self-reported non-voters were not asked who they voted for.
- Voters in states with Senate races were asked the Senate vote questions, non-voters in states with Senate races are asked the Senate preference questions, and respondents in states without Senate races are not asked the Senate questions.
- Respondents who have moved to a new state since 2004 were asked the Senate vote/preference items appropriate for their current state of residence.
- The detailed follow-up questions in the social networks section were asked of the same number of contacts reported at the beginning of that section.
- Cross tabulations indicate correct case counts receiving follow-up or branched questions.

Data Anomalies

Some minor item-level oddities or inconsistencies in the data are noted in the Pilot Study Codebook.

During the 2006 Pilot Study data collection, ANES staff identified one respondent selection error among the 1,212 respondents from the 2004 time series study. One person who completed a 2004 time series questionnaire was not an eligible sample member. This person completed the interview because of an interviewer error. Therefore, this case was deleted from the Pilot Study sample, leaving 1,211 people eligible for the 2006 Pilot Study interview.

In ANES documentation of the number of 2004 respondents or the number of eligible sample members in 2006, you may see either the number 1,211 or 1,212, depending on

the context. The number 1,212 is present in documentation of the 2004 study prepared before this selection error was discovered in 2006. Also, the number 1,212 was used when the 2004 weights were developed. Because the 2006 weights were based on the 2004 weights, and because it is not cost effective to re-weight the 2004 data based on 1,211 cases, it was necessary to use an eligible sample size of 1,212 in some weight calculations for the 2006 study. There were 1,211 valid interviews in 2004 and therefore 1,211 eligible sample cases in 2006. However, weights in 2006 were weighted based upon all 1,212 cases for which the 2004 weights were developed.

5.2. Administrative Variables

Administration

Administrative variables provide information about the administration of the interviews, such as the date and time of the interview session(s), the number of days between sessions (if any), the respondent's time zone, the duration of the interview, the amount of incentives paid to the respondent, the types of letters sent to the respondent, and a summary of the types of dispositions reached in previous call attempts. The administrative variables are variables V06P201a through V06P231 and are described in detail in the study's codebook.

Randomization

Randomization was employed extensively and served several purposes in the 2006 ANES Pilot Study. Randomizations employed in survey administration are documented in variables V06P401 through V06P435n, which provide case-level randomization values. The codebook documents individual variables. This section describes the general approach to randomization.

To test and control for the effects that response option order may have on respondents' answers, we randomly assigned respondents to receive response options in "forward" order or "reverse" order on selected questions. For example, a respondent assigned to "forward" reading of response options would have received item Mod1_1 (V06P501) as follows: "First, how much do you think people can change the kind of person they are? Completely, a lot, a moderate amount, a little, or not at all." A respondent assigned to "reverse" order received the question, "First, how much do you think people can change the kind of person they are? Not at all, a little, a moderate amount, a lot, or completely?" The data file is coded consistently for all respondents, so that for Mod1_1 (V06P501), a response code of 1 always means "completely," regardless of the order in which the response options were read.

The "forward" or "reverse" assignment thus determined two things: 1) the order in which response options were read to the respondent as part of the question text, and 2) the order in which the numbered response categories appeared onscreen in the CATI instrument for interviewer coding. However, the forward/reverse assignment has no effect on the

numerical code used to record the respondent's answer. The variable V06P401 indicates whether the respondent received forward or reverse response order for the following 2006 Pilot items:

```
Mod1_1     Mod2_1     Mod3_1     Mod3_3     Mod3_4     Mod3_6
Mod3_7     Mod3_8     Mod4_1     Mod5_A1    Mod5_A2    Mod5_A3
Mod6_A1    Mod7_B1    Mod7_B2    Mod7_B3    Mod7_B4    Mod7_B5
Mod7_B6    Mod7_B7    Mod7_B8    Mod7_B9    Mod7_B10   Mod7_B11
Mod7_B12   Mod11_2    Mod11_4    Mod13_3_1  Mod13_3_2  Mod13_3_3
Mod13_7_1  Mod13_7_2  Mod13_7_3  Mod13_12_1 Mod13_12_2 Mod13_12_3
Mod14_A1   Mod14_A2   Mod14_A3   Mod14_B2   Mod15_2    Mod15_4
Mod15_5    Mod16_A1   Mod16_A2   Mod16_B1   Mod16_B2   Mod16_3
Mod16_4    Mod17_B1   Mod17_B2   Mod17_B3   Mod17_B4   Mod20_A5
Mod20_A10  Mod20_A15  Mod20_A20  Mod20_A25  Mod20_A30  Mod20_A35
Mod25_1    Mod25_2    Mod25_3    Mod25_4    Mod29_1    Mod29_2
```

The second major category of randomization concerns the assignment of respondents to experimental categories in which one group received one question and another group received an alternative question.   This kind of randomization was done in modules 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, 16 through 21, 23, 24, 26, and 27. Some of these randomizations assigned respondents to entirely different questions, while others assigned respondents to receive alternative versions of questions that differed only slightly from one another. For example, in Module 19 (Party Identification), one randomization determined the order in which the words "Democrat" and "Republican" appeared in otherwise identical questions.

A third type of randomization, performed in the Abortion module (20), independently assigned a .5 probability that any given respondent would be asked about any given reason for having an abortion. This randomization reduced the average administration time of the entire questionnaire without removing any questions from the survey.

Lastly, question order was varied randomly in modules 15, 20, 22, 23, and 25, and in the debriefing questions posed to telephone interviewers. For example, in the Abortion module, the order of the topics was randomized, and in the Gender module (23), the order of the parties and the order of the issues (crime or education) was randomized.

5.3. Derived Variables

Derived variables are either based upon transformations of responses or cross-referencing responses to external data sources. For example, because the 2004 questionnaire asked the respondent's date of birth, the respondent's age as of a particular date is easily derived from the questionnaire data. When the respondent's home address was known, then geographic information such as the respondent's Congressional District was added to the dataset by reference to external sources.

The ANES Pilot Study includes several derived variables. Several of these are "summary" variables of frequently used information, such as the seven-point party identification summary variable that indicates the respondent's placement on a seven

point scale ranging from Strong Democrat to Strong Republican. Placement on this scale is based upon respondents' answers to more than one question.

Additional derived variables include geographic data concerning the respondent. These "geocode" data, appearing at variables V06P101 through V06P114b, include the state, region, and Congressional District (for the 110th Congress) in which the respondent lived in 2006, and whether or not the respondent moved since 2004.

5.4. Coding

There were very few open-ended questions in the 2006 ANES Pilot Study, so little coding was done with this dataset. Coding is documented in the appendix to the 2006 ANES Pilot Study Codebook, available from the ANES website (www.electionstudies.org).

6. Outcome Rates and Sample Dispositions, Weights, and Variance Estimation

This chapter discusses the survey response rates (overall and for questionnaire items) and other outcome rates, the creation and use of weights, and procedures to estimate and use sampling error statistics.

Reinterview and Response Rates

The unweighted reinterview rate for the 2006 ANES Pilot Study was calculated by dividing 675 completions by 1,211 persons eligible for the survey, yielding 55.7 percent. The unweighted response rate in 2006 was calculated by multiplying the 2004 pre-election wave response rate (66.1 percent) by the 2006 reinterview rate; this response rate is 36.8 percent. Section 6.1 elaborates the basis for these and other outcome rate calculations.

6.1. Outcome Rates and Sample Dispositions

The American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) has adopted standard definitions for four survey outcome rates (AAPOR 2006). The *contact rate* is the proportion of the sample that was reached to be asked for an interview. The *cooperation rate* is the proportion of eligible sample members contacted who were interviewed. The *refusal rate* is the proportion of eligible sample members contacted who ultimately refused to do an interview (whether they began an interview or not). The *response rate* is the proportion of eligible sample members who were interviewed.

Sample Dispositions

The final dispositions of the cases in the sample are shown in Table 3. Of the sample of 1,211 individuals, 675 completed an interview and 536 did not. No cases were of unknown eligibility and no cases were ineligible for an interview, because the eligible sample was defined as the 1,211 individuals who completed a valid pre-election interview in the 2004 ANES time series study. Of the 536 nonresponding cases, 247 were never contacted because we could not obtain a working telephone number for them, and 289 were contacted (either directly or by proxy) but did not complete an interview. Of these 289, 11 had died since the 2004 interview, 15 were reportedly away for the duration of the field period, 25 had health or hearing problems that prevented an interview, 121 refused the interview (115 during the introduction, and 6 after starting the questionnaire), and 113 reached the end of the field period in "callback" status, meaning that contact was made with the respondent's household, and the respondent had not explicitly refused the interview, but they had not completed it either. Of these 113, 6 had begun the interview and 107 had not. Each disposition category is further described following Table 3.

When a landline telephone number was not available for a member of the sample but a mobile/cellular telephone number was available, we attempted to conduct an interview by

calling the sampled individual's cell phone. Of the sample of 1,211 individuals, 100 involved interview attempts on cell phones. Table 3 shows the dispositions for the total sample as well as separate columns showing the dispositions for the portions of the sample that were called on landline and cellular telephones.

Table 3.   Final disposition status of ANES Pilot Study sample, by type of telephone line (unweighted)

Disposition	Total		Landline		Cell phone	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total sample	1211	100.0	1111	100.0	100	100.0
Complete interviews	675	55.7	626	56.3	49	49.0
Standard	629	51.9	583	52.5	46	46.0
Refusal conversion	46	3.8	43	3.9	3	3.0
Eligible nonresponse	536	44.3	485	43.7	51	51.0
No contact, no working number	247	20.4	221	19.9	26	26.0
Not in service	105	8.7	98	8.8	7	7.0
Wrong number	109	9.0	93	8.4	16	16.0
No number provided	14	1.2	14	1.3	0	0.0
Other bad number	19	1.6	16	1.4	3	3.0
Contacts not complete	289	23.9	264	23.8	25	25.0
Respondent deceased	11	0.9	11	1.0	0	0.0
Away for duration	15	1.2	14	1.3	1	1.0
Child/teen phone	1	0.1	1	0.1	0	0.0
Foreign language	3	0.2	3	0.3	0	0.0
Health problems	22	1.8	22	2.0	0	0.0
Hearing problems	3	0.2	3	0.3	0	0.0
Callbacks (at introduction)	107	8.8	94	8.5	13	13.0
Callbacks (after introduction)	6	0.5	6	0.5	0	0.0
Refusals (at introduction)	115	9.5	104	9.4	11	11.0
Refusals (after introduction)	6	0.5	6	0.5	0	0.0
Unknown eligibility	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Not eligible	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

Note: See text for definitions of disposition categories.
Source: 2006 ANES Pilot Study.

The disposition categories in the Table 3 are described as follows:

- *Total sample*: all the individuals in the sample.

- *Complete interviews*: interviews in which all questions in the questionnaire were administered. (No partial interviews are counted as complete.) This is AAPOR disposition category 1.
    o *Standard*: interviews completed using standard procedures.
    o *Refusal conversion*: interviews completed using refusal conversion procedures after the respondent initially refused to complete the interview.

34

- *Eligible nonresponse*: individuals in the sample who did not complete the questionnaire. AAPOR category 2.
  - o *No contact, no working number*: the sampled individual, or his or her household, was never reached.
    - *Not in service*: the telephone number is not in service. This is usually announced by the telephone company with a recording.
    - *Wrong number*: whoever answers the telephone reports that the sampled individual cannot be reached at this number.
    - *No number provided*: the sample data do not include any telephone number for the sampled individual, even after research efforts to find a number.
    - *Other bad number*: the interviewer reached a fax or modem tone, a business or government, or was unable to reach the sampled individual for some other reason.
  - o *Contacts not complete*: an interviewer reached the sampled individual or a member of his or her household, but the individual did not complete the interview.
    - *Respondent deceased*: the respondent was reported to have died.
    - *Away for duration*: the respondent was reported to be unavailable for the duration of the study field period.
    - *Child/teen phone*: we reached a telephone belonging to a child and could not reach an adult.
    - *Foreign language*: we could not communicate with the person answering the phone, who spoke a foreign language.
    - *Health problems*: the individual had health problems making it impossible to complete the interview.
    - *Hearing problems*: the individual had hearing difficulties making it impossible to complete the interview.
    - *Callbacks (at introduction)*: during the introduction (before the first ANES question was asked), the person answering the phone neither voiced a refusal nor completed an interview, and remained eligible for a call back. This category includes requests to call back later and hang-ups.
    - *Callbacks (after introduction)*: the respondent answered at least the first ANES question but requested a callback, or the line was disconnected, before all questions were administered.
    - *Refusals (at introduction)*: during the introduction (before the first ANES question), the sampled individual refused the interview or another person answering the phone refused to put the sampled individual on the line.
    - *Refusals (after introduction)*: the respondent answered at least the first ANES question but refused to continue before all questions were administered.

- *Unknown eligibility*: individuals whose status as members of the sample is not known. AAPOR category 3. There were no cases with unknown eligibility because eligibility for the study was defined by having completed the 2004 ANES.

- *Not eligible*: individuals who are not eligible for an interview because they do not meet the selection criteria for the study. AAPOR category 4. There were no ineligible cases in the sample because eligibility for the study was defined by having completed the 2004 ANES, allowing the sample to be limited to eligible cases.

Outcome Rates

Survey outcome rates shown below were calculated from the disposition data in Table 3.

When discussing outcome rates from the Pilot Study, it is important to distinguish reinterview rates from response rates. Reinterview rates apply only to the Pilot Study stage of data collection. Response rates account for the fact that the Pilot Study sample of 1,211 individuals is itself a group that responded to the pre-election wave of the 2004 ANES time series study.

Reinterview contact rate: the sum of complete interviews plus contacts not complete (675 + 289), divided by the total (1,211), which is 79.6 percent.

Reinterview cooperation rate: the number of completions (675) divided by the sum of completions and contacts not complete (675 + 289), which is 70.0 percent.

Reinterview refusal rate: the sum of both types of refusals (115 + 6) divided by the total sample size (1,211), which is 10.0 percent.

Reinterview rate: the completed interviews (675) divided by the total eligible sample (1,211), which is 55.7 percent.

Response rate: the completed interviews (675) divided by the total sample size of the 2004 ANES time series pre-election survey (1,833, not shown in Table 3), which is 36.8 percent.

These rate calculations correspond to unweighted AAPOR rate 1 (contact rate 1, cooperation rate 1, etc.). For some purposes, weighted rates are preferable, and alternative methods of calculation are possible. In previous documentation of ANES studies, reinterview rates have been calculated by deleting from the denominator those respondents who completed an initial interview and died before the next interview. With this approach to calculating outcome rates, deceased respondents do not lower the response rate. In the Pilot Study, however, this approach is not appropriate because eligible sample members have been defined as those who completed the pre-election wave of the 2004 ANES time series. Very few respondents died between 2004 and 2006, so this difference will have little or no effect on conclusions about the quality of the sample or the success of survey operations.

Reinterview Rates by Respondent Characteristics

Table 4 shows reinterview rates by respondent characteristics. Because each eligible member of the sample for the 2006 ANES Pilot Study completed a pre-election interview in the 2004 ANES, we can examine characteristics associated with response (or non-response) to the Pilot Study. More extensive analyses can be performed, but it is within the scope of this methodology report to briefly describe statistically significant variations in reinterview rates for different groups of respondents.

Table 4 presents both unweighted and weighted reinterview rates. Unweighted rates are appropriate for gauging the success of field operations because they describe the proportion of each sample group that was reinterviewed. Weighted rates should also be considered when gauging the success of the sample in representing the population. The weights discussed below are unweighted.

The reinterview rate varies for sample subgroups according to demographic characteristics such as age, educational attainment, race-ethnicity, income, urbanicity, and home tenure. Among age groups, reinterview rates ranged from a low of 42 percent for sample members age 18-29 and 30-39 to a high of 66 percent for those age 40-49 and 60 to 69. Education showed a large range of reinterview rates, from a low of 32 percent for those with less than a high school diploma to a high of 68 percent for college graduates. Within racial-ethnic groups, Hispanics had a reinterview rate of 37 percent, and non-Hispanic blacks had a similar reinterview rate of 38 percent, while non-Hispanic whites had a reinterview rate of 62 percent. People with annual incomes under $11,000 had a 47 percent reinterview rate, while people with incomes of $120,000 or more had a 70 percent reinterview rate. People living in urban areas had a 54 percent reinterview rate, while those living in rural areas had a 64 percent reinterview rate. Renters had a 40 percent reinterview rate, while home owners had a 63 percent reinterview rate.

The reinterview rate also varies for sample subgroups according to political characteristics measured on the 2004 pre-election interview such as self-reported voter turnout in 2000, vote choice in 2000, and party identification. Among self-reported non-voters in the 2000 election, the reinterview rate was 41 percent; among self-reported voters, it was 63 percent. Among those who said in 2004 that they voted for Al Gore in 2000, the 2006 reinterview rate was 59 percent; among those who said they voted for George W. Bush, the 2006 reinterview rate was 66 percent. Within party identification categories, reinterview rates ranged from 44 percent for pure independents to 66 percent for not-strong Republicans.

These variations in reinterview rates suggest the presence of nonresponse bias in which people of high socio-economic status are more likely to complete the ANES interview, and in which people who are politically engaged (indicated by self-reported voter turnout) are more likely to complete the interview. Nonresponse bias according to the characteristics shown in Table 4 is examined below in section 6.4.

Table 4.   Reinterview rates in the 2006 ANES Pilot Study, by respondent characteristics

Pre-election characteristics in 2004	Unweighted 2004 sample size	Reinterview rate (percent)	
		Unweighted	Weighted
Total	1211	55.7	52.6
Age (V043250 recoded)			
18-29	239	41.8	38.8
30-39	197	42.1	40.7
40-49	233	65.7	64.6
50-59	232	62.9	61.3
60-69	175	65.7	63.0
70 or older	135	57.8	51.3
Educational attainment (V043250 recoded)			
Less than HS diploma	110	31.8	27.6
High school diploma	355	48.2	46.7
Some college	384	57.8	58.0
College graduate	362	68.2	68.1
Sex (V041109a)			
Male	566	54.9	51.4
Female	645	56.4	53.9
Race-ethnicity (V043299 recoded) (missing data omitted)			
White non-Hispanic	875	61.9	59.1
Black non-Hispanic	182	37.9	35.1
Hispanic	87	36.8	32.2
Other non-Hispanic	59	50.8	50.9
Respondent income (V043294 recoded)			
$10,999 or less	188	47.3	46.7
$11,000 to $19,999	192	49.0	45.0
$20,000 to $44,999	294	55.1	51.8
$45,000 to $79,999	169	58.8	55.0
$80,000 to $119,999	179	69.3	66.5
$120,000 or more	79	69.6	71.6
DK/Refused	110	46.4	44.5
Urbanicity (V041213)			
Rural	227	63.4	60.1
Urban	984	54.0	50.9
Home tenure (V043312 recoded)			
Own	830	63.0	60.2
Rent	352	40.1	35.7
Other/Refused	29	37.9	27.6
Voted in 2000 (V043002 recoded)			
Yes	816	63.0	61.3
No	383	40.7	36.6
Don't know	12	41.7	45.5

Table continues. See notes at end of table.

Table 4.   Reinterview rates in the 2006 ANES Pilot Study, by respondent characteristics
            —continued

Pre-election characteristics in 2004	Unweighted 2004 sample size	Reinterview rate (percent)	
		Unweighted	Weighted
Vote choice in 2000 (v043003) (missing and other omitted)			
Bush	400	66.0	64.9
Gore	371	59.0	56.1
Party ID (V043116 recoded)			
Strong Democrat	203	56.7	53.5
Not very strong Democrat	179	49.2	43.0
Independent, lean Democratic	210	52.9	50.2
Independent	117	43.6	40.0
Independent, lean Republican	138	56.5	54.0
Not very strong Republican	154	66.2	63.1
Strong Republican	193	63.7	62.9
Other/apolitical/DK	17	41.2	42.1

Note: Rates presented here equal the number of 2006 respondents in the category divided by the number of eligible sample members, which is defined as the valid respondents to the first wave of the 2004 American National Election Study. This is a reinterview rate. The overall response rate for the 2006 survey is the product of this reinterview rate and the 2004 survey response rate. Unweighted response rates are useful for gauging the success of field operations. Weighted response rates are usually more appropriate than unweighted rates for gauging the success of the sample at representing the population. The weighted response rate is computed using the 2004 final weight (V040101).
Source: 2004 American National Election Study and 2006 ANES Pilot Study (datasets).

Item Nonresponse and Missing Data

Item nonresponse occurs when a respondent does not answer a survey question that was asked. Item nonresponse in the Pilot Study was coded as Refused or Don't Know, as appropriate. Item nonresponse was minimal on most questions, typically between 0 and 1 percent.

Item nonresponse may occur when respondents are concerned about protecting their privacy, when they do not understand what is being asked, when they are not satisfied with the response options, when they are so unsure of their answer that they decline to guess, or for other reasons. High rates of item nonresponse may indicate sub-par items. Questionnaire variables for which item nonrepsonse exceeded 2.00 percent (unweighted) are shown in Table 5. There were 22 such variables.

Table 5. ANES 2006 Pilot Study items with item nonresponse rates exceeding 2.00 percent, by nonresponse rate (unweighted)

Variable	Item ID	Question topic	Valid cases	Response	Nonresponse Don't know	Refused	Total	Percent
v06p546	Mod8_2	Amount R could borrow	573	522	39	12	51	8.90
v06p551a	Mod19_4	Unemployment rate	675	656	19	0	19	2.81
v06p566	Mod11_8	God's responsibility	538	512	8	18	26	4.83
v06p586	Mod12_B8	Optimism/pessimism	100	97	3	0	3	3.00
v06p607	Mod13_11_1	Social network party ID	103	94	9	0	9	8.74
v06p612	Mod13_11_2	Social network party ID	77	70	7	0	7	9.09
v06p614	Mod13_8_3	Social network party ID	343	336	7	0	7	2.04
v06p617	Mod13_11_3	Social network party ID	69	64	5	0	5	7.25
v06p613	Mod13_14_1	Social network, distance	9	7	2	0	2	22.22
v06p626	Mod13_14_2	Social network, distance	6	5	1	0	1	16.67
v06p640	Mod15_6	Likes about federal gov.	337	330	4	3	7	2.08
v06p684	Mod19_A4	Party ID	75	73	2	0	2	2.67
v06p705	Mod20_A14	Abortion, incest	38	36	2	0	2	5.26
v06p717	Mod20_A24	Abortion, birth defect	42	41	1	0	1	2.38
v06p781	Mod26_9	House preference	38	37	1	0	1	2.63
v06p782	Mod26_10	Senate preference	121	118	3	0	3	2.48
v06p783	Mod26_12	Senate preference	30	28	2	0	2	6.67
v06p784	Mod26_13	House turnout	514	499	15	0	15	2.92
v06p785	Mod26_15	House vote party	444	427	10	7	17	3.83
v06p786	Mod26_16	Senate turnout	405	396	9	0	9	2.22
v06p787	Mod26_18	Senate vote party	353	339	5	9	14	3.97
v06p802c	Mod27_B12	Bush approval	30	29	1	0	1	3.33

Note: Only questionnaire variables are shown; derived variables are not shown because they are based on the items shown. The "Valid cases" column shows the number of people who were asked the question. The "Response" column shows the number of people who responded with an answer assigned a code other than "Don't know" or "Refused."
Source: 2006 ANES Pilot Study (dataset).

Nonresponse for any item can be found by checking the variable frequency in any standard statistical program and reviewing the Refused and Don't Know codes. System missing data reflect legitimate skips and do not indicate item nonresponse.

Missing data are not imputed in ANES datasets. Data users should consider carefully the implications of missing data for their analyses. If analysts ignore missing data, most statistical software packages will perform listwise (also known as casewise) deletion of missing data, dropping the cases for which any variable involved in an analysis has missing values. If data are missing completely at random, listwise deletion produces unbiased estimates. When data are not missing completely at random, or when it is important to retain all cases in the analysis, other methods may be better. See Allison (2002) for information on handling missing data.

6.2. 2004 Weights

The 2004 ANES pre-election survey respondents constituted the sample for the 2006 ANES Pilot Study. As such, the person-level analysis weights for the 2004 ANES would constitute correct weights for the 2006 Pilot Study in the absence of unit nonresponse. This section briefly describes how the 2004 weights were originally created. The 2004

weights were adjusted for nonresponse in 2006 according to procedures described in the next section.

The 2004 person-level analysis weight included in the 2004 ANES data was constructed using a household selection component, a person-level sample selection component, nonresponse adjustment factors, and a post-stratification factor.

Household Selection: Each household selected for the 2004 NES had an equal probability of selection. The inverse of this probability results in an inflation factor of 38,832.4 for each household in the sample.

Person-Level Sample Selection: Within sample households a single adult respondent was chosen at random to be interviewed. The number of eligible adults varies from one household to another, so the random selection of a single adult introduces inequality into respondents' selection probabilities. The respondent selection weight compensates for these unequal selection probabilities. The person-level selection weight is the product of the household selection weight and the within household selection weight. The within-household selection weight is equal to the number of eligible persons in the household and is capped at 3.

Nonresponse Adjustement: The base weight equals the product of the selection weight and the household level nonresponse adjustment factors. Nonresponse adjustment cells for the 2004 ANES sample were formed by crossing metropolitan statistical area (MSA) status by the four Census regions. A nonresponse adjustment factor equal to the inverse of the response rate in each cell was applied to the interview cases. See Table B of the 2004 NES Codebook for the nonresponse adjustment factors used to create the 2004 weights.

Post-stratification: The 2004 ANES weights are post-stratified to 2004 Current Population Survey (CPS) March Supplement proportions for six (6) ages by four (4) education categories. Table C of the 2004 NES Codebook shows the weighted estimates and proportions for the 24 cells for the 2004 CPS and the 2004 NES. The post-stratification adjustment is computed by dividing the CPS weighted total by the 2004 NES total weighted by the nonresponse adjusted selection weight.

The 2004 final analysis weight is the product of the household level non-response adjustment factor, the number of eligible persons, and a person-level post-stratification factor. The final analysis weight for the 2004 ANES sample is scaled to sum to 1212, the total number of respondents. (One case was later determined to be ineligible.) This weight is trimmed at the 1st and 99th percentiles and then re-scaled to match the 2004 CPS proportions for the 24 age-by-education cells.

6.3. 2006 Nonresponse Adjustment Weights

The 2006 ANES Pilot Study data set includes a person-level analysis weight, which incorporates sampling, nonresponse, and post-stratification factors. **Analysts should use the 2006 weight (V06P002) for all analyses intended to generalize to the population** (i.e., U.S. citizens age 18 or older as of Election Day in November of 2004), unless they have a specific reason to choose an alternative weighting approach of their own devising.

The 2006 weight was created by applying an adjustment factor to the 2004 pre-election analysis weight (V040101). This adjustment factor accounts for nonresponse in 2006 insofar as 2006 nonresponse is a function of sample members' age and educational attainment. In 2006, reinterview response rates by age ranged from a low of 41.8 percent for persons age 18-29 as of November 2004 to a high of 65.7 percent for those age 40-49 or 60-69 as of November 2004. Response rates by educational attainment ranged from a low of 31.8 percent for those with less than a high school diploma in 2004 to a high of 68.2 percent for college graduates. (All response rates are unweighted.) Reinterview response rates (both weighted and unweighted) for selected respondent characteristics measured at the time of the 2004 pre-election interview were shown in table 4.

The 2006 weight adjustments were made in three steps. First, each of the 1,212[1] sample members who completed the 2004 ANES pre-election interview were assigned to one of the 24 cells that result from cross-tabulating age by educational level using the categories shown in Table C in the 2004 NES Codebook. (The age categories are 18-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60-69, and 70-90. The educational attainment categories are less than a high school diploma, high school diploma, some college, and college graduate.) One of these cells (age 30-39 with less than a high school diploma) contains no 2006 respondents, so this cell was merged with an adjacent cell (age 40-49 with less than a high school diploma) for purposes of the weight calculation, resulting in a total of 23 cells. Second, for each cell, a weight adjustment factor was computed by dividing the sum of the 2004 weights for all sample members in the cell by the sum of the weights for the 2006 respondents in the same cell. Last, the 2006 analysis weight was computed by multiplying the 2004 analysis weight by the adjustment factor described in the step above, and then scaling the weight to sum to the sample size of 675.[2]

The program code used to create the 2006 weights is shown in Appendix F.

This 2006 weight adjustment reflects a minimalist weighting approach, consistent with the prior approach taken by ANES. More information about the construction of the 2004

---

[1] The original 2004 sample size of 1,212 was used to calculate 2006 weights. A problem with the integrity of one case (case 357) was identified during the 2006 data collection, and this case was removed from the 2006 sample and may be dropped from the 2004 data file. However, the 2004 weights were developed for 1,212 cases and have not been recalculated for a sample of 1,211. It was therefore necessary to use all 1,212 cases for the development of the Pilot Study analysis weight so that proportions would match population targets.

[2] Users should note that as a consequence of scaling the weight to sum to the sample size—consistent with traditional ANES practice—all population size estimates (that is, estimates of the number of persons in the population) run with the ANES data are meaningless.

analysis weight that was adjusted to create the 2006 weight is available in the previous section of this chapter and in the 2004 NES Codebook.

The 2006 weights were not trimmed, and range from approximately 0.24 to 12, with a mean of 1.0 and a variance of 0.70. Outliers with particularly high weight values contribute to variance. Analysts concerned about weight outliers may wish to consider trimming weights greater than 5 (of which there are 5 cases) by recoding them to equal 5 and reporting the results of their analysis with both the trimmed weight and the published weight. There is not an objective scientific basis to choose a threshold for weight trimming, however, when the weights are trimmed using this threshold, the variance of the weights is reduced from 0.70 to 0.47.

6.4. Nonresponse Bias

Nonresponse bias in the Pilot Study can be measured readily by comparing the Pilot Study data to the 2004 ANES data. Because the sample eligible for the Pilot Study (and the sampling frame) is the respondents to the 2004 pre-election ANES survey, we can compare the responding sample from 2006 to the full eligible sample using any variables of interest from the 2004 pre-election survey. Any difference between the Pilot Study respondents and the eligible sample constitutes bias in the estimate. Such bias will be largely attributable to unit nonresponse bias because most nonresponse in the study was unit nonresponse.

A complete nonresponse bias analysis of the Pilot Study is beyond the scope of this report, but it is appropriate to examine indicators of bias briefly. Table 6 shows nonresponse bias in the 2006 ANES Pilot Study for several 2004 characteristics that were measured when 2006 respondents and non-respondents completed the pre-election wave of the 2004 ANES time series study. The table also presents selected post-election characteristics measured only in the 2006 study, which may be informative for comparison to other data sources.

As described in section 6.3 above, the nonresponse weight adjustment in 2006 was based on age and educational attainment, using the same age and educational attainment categories presented in table 4 (and table 6). Ordinarily cell weighting would cause the bias in the 2006 weighted estimates to be zero in every category of age and educational attainment. The table shows that two small biases differ from zero. Because there were no respondents in 2006 who were age 30-39 and had less than a high school diploma, it was necessary to merge this cell with an adjacent cell. This caused the small bias seen in the 30-39 and 40-49 age categories.

Most biases in the 2006 weighted estimates are less than 2 percentage points. Larger biases are typically smaller for the 2006 weighted estimates than for estimates using the 2004 weight (which does not account for nonresponse in 2006) or unweighted estimates.

Some biases exceed 5 percentage points. After weighting, the Pilot Study sample still produces a biased estimate of the white population relative to other racial/ethnic groups (+6.6 percentage points) and a biased estimate of the prevalence of home ownership (+6.5 percentage points).

It is noteworthy that the estimate of voter turnout in 2000, in addition to being larger than the true voter turnout, is further biased in the wrong direction in the 2006 data (+5.5 percentage points). However, the 2006 weight reduces the bias, relative to the 11 percentage point biases in the unweighted estimate and the estimate employing the 2004 weight.

It is also noteworthy that although the *nonresponse* bias (of 2006 respondents compared to 2004 respondents) in estimates of vote choice for Al Gore and George W. Bush in 2000 are -3.9 percentage points and 1.7 percentage points, respectively, the overall bias in the estimate of voting for Gore is larger. The actual popular vote in 2000 was 47.9 percent for Bush and 48.4 percent for Gore. The estimate from the 2006 Pilot Study is 52.7 percent for Bush and 42.0 percent for Gore; Gore won the popular vote by 0.5 points, while the Pilot estimate shows Bush winning by 10.7 points. About half of this difference is due to nonresponse bias in the 2006 study (the 1.7 and 3.9 point nonresponse biases), and about half of the difference is due to the bias in the 2004 ANES vote choice estimate.

Estimates of post-election characteristics from the 2006 survey show President Bush's approval at 27 percent, 2006 midterm election turnout at 74 percent, and a distribution of party identification with 54 percent Democrats (or leaners), 7 percent pure independents, and 38 percent Republicans (or leaners).

The presidential approval rate is lower than estimates from media polls in the field during the ANES field period, which ranged from 30 percent to 42 percent with an average in the mid 30s.[3] However, the Pilot Study tests a new question about approval that explicitly offers a "neither approve nor disapprove" response, unlike standard media poll questions about presidential approval. (ANES asked, "Do you approve, disapprove, or neither approve nor disapprove of the way George W. Bush is handling his job as president?") In the media polls, the percentage of respondents in the "unsure" category ranges from 2 to 9 percent, with most in the range of 4 to 8 percent. In the Pilot Study fully 16 percent of respondents said "neither." It appears that the difference between

---

[3] Media polls typically ask "Do you approve or disapprove of the way George W. Bush is handling his job as president?" (used by Gallup, Newsweek, CBS, CNN, and others) or similar variants such as "Do you approve or disapprove of the job George W. Bush is doing as president?" (used by FOX News/Opinion Dynamics) or "In general, do you approve or disapprove of the job that George W. Bush is doing as president?" (NBC News/Wall Street Journal). Newsweek, in two polls taken during the Pilot Study field period, estimated 31 and 32 percent approval. CBS, in three polls, estimated 34, 31, and 30 percent approval. Fox News estimated 38 percent; CNN estimated 38, 37, and 36 percent; Gallup estimated 33, 38, 35, and 37 percent; the NBC/Wall Street Journal estimate was 34 percent. Retrieved from http://www.pollingreport.com/BushJob.htm and http://www.pollingreport.com/BushJob1.htm.

other surveys and the ANES result is attributable to the different wording of the Pilot Study question.

Table 6. Nonresponse bias of percentage distributions in the 2006 ANES Pilot Study, and percentage distribution of electorate

| Characteristic | 2004 respondents | | 2006 respondents (n=675) | | | | | |
| | Unweighted estimate | Weighted estimate | Unweighted | | 2004 weight | | 2006 weight | |
			estimate	bias	estimate	bias	estimate	bias
Pre-election characteristics in 2004								
Age (V043250 recoded)								
18-29	19.7	20.7	14.8	-5.9	15.3	-5.4	20.7	0.0
30-39	16.3	17.8	12.3	-5.5	13.8	-4.0	16.2	-1.6
40-49	19.2	20.3	22.7	2.4	25.0	4.7	21.8	1.5
50-59	19.1	17.5	21.6	4.1	20.4	2.9	17.5	0.0
60-69	14.4	11.1	17.0	5.9	13.3	2.2	11.1	0.0
70 or older	11.2	12.6	11.6	-1.0	12.2	-0.4	12.6	0.0
Educational attainment (V043250 recoded)								
Less than HS diploma	9.2	14.4	5.2	-9.2	7.5	-6.9	14.4	0.0
High school diploma	29.3	31.4	25.3	-6.1	28.0	-3.4	31.4	0.0
Some college	31.7	28.5	32.9	4.4	31.4	2.9	28.5	0.0
College graduate	29.9	25.6	36.6	11.0	33.1	7.5	25.6	0.0
Sex (V041109a)								
Male	46.7	48.5	46.1	-2.4	47.4	-1.1	46.8	-1.7
Female	53.3	51.5	53.9	2.4	52.6	1.1	53.2	1.7
Race-ethnicity (V043299 recoded) (missing data omitted; valid percents shown)								
White non-Hispanic	72.8	71.9	80.5	8.6	80.4	8.5	78.5	6.6
Black non-Hispanic	15.1	15.9	10.3	-5.6	10.5	-5.4	12.3	-3.6
Hispanic	7.2	7.5	4.8	-2.7	4.5	-3.0	5.0	-2.5
Other non-Hispanic	4.9	4.8	4.5	-0.3	4.6	-0.2	4.2	-0.6
Respondent income (V043294 recoded)								
$10,999 or less	15.5	17.7	13.2	-4.5	15.7	-2.0	20.1	2.4
$11,000 to $19,999	15.8	16.7	13.9	-2.8	14.3	-2.4	15.3	-1.4
$20,000 to $44,999	24.3	23.1	24.0	0.9	22.8	-0.3	23.8	0.7
$45,000 to $79,999	14.0	13.3	14.8	1.5	13.7	0.4	12.6	-0.7
$80,000 to $119,999	14.8	13.3	18.4	5.1	16.9	3.6	14.1	0.8
$120,000 or more	6.5	6.1	8.1	2.0	8.4	2.3	6.7	0.6
DK/Refused	9.1	9.8	7.6	-2.2	8.3	-1.5	7.5	-2.3
Urbanicity (V041213)								
Rural	18.7	19.6	21.3	1.7	22.4	2.8	21.3	1.7
Urban	81.3	80.4	78.7	-1.7	77.6	-2.8	78.7	-1.7
Home tenure (V043312 recoded)								
Own	68.6	69.9	77.5	7.6	79.8	9.9	76.4	6.5
Rent	29.0	27.7	20.9	-6.8	18.9	-8.8	22.3	-5.4
Other/Refused	2.4	2.4	1.6	-0.8	1.3	-1.1	1.3	-1.1
Voted in 2000 (V043002 recoded)								
Yes	67.4	64.8	76.1	11.3	75.4	10.6	70.3	5.5
No	31.6	34.2	23.1	-11.1	23.8	-10.4	28.4	-5.8
Don't know	1.0	0.9	0.7	-0.2	0.8	-0.1	1.4	0.5

Table continues. See notes at end of table.

Table 6. Nonresponse bias of percentage distributions in the 2006 ANES Pilot Study, and percentage distribution of electorate characteristics: 2004 and 2006—continued

	2004 respondents		2006 respondents (n=675)					
	Unweighted	Weighted	Unweighted		2004 weight		2006 weight	
Characteristic	estimate	estimate	estimate	bias	estimate	bias	estimate	bias
Pre-election characteristics in 2004—continued								
Vote choice in 2000 (v043003 recoded; DK/ref. omitted)								
Bush	50.2	51.0	52.8	1.8	54.4	3.4	52.7	1.7
Gore	46.5	45.9	43.8	-2.1	42.3	-3.6	42.0	-3.9
Others	3.3	3.2	3.4	0.2	3.3	0.1	5.3	2.1
Bush approval in 2004 (V043024 recoded)								
Approve	49.8	49.7	52.7	3.0	52.9	3.2	50.7	1.0
Disapprove	47.9	47.8	45.6	-2.2	45.2	-2.6	47.4	-0.4
DK/refused	2.3	2.4	1.6	-0.8	1.9	-0.5	1.9	-0.5
Party ID (V043116 recoded)								
Strong Democrat	16.7	16.3	17.0	0.7	16.6	0.3	16.9	0.6
Not very strong Dem.	14.8	15.3	13.0	-2.3	12.6	-2.7	14.0	-1.3
Independent, lean Dem.	17.3	17.2	16.4	-0.8	16.4	-0.8	15.5	-1.7
Independent	9.7	9.6	7.6	-2.0	7.2	-2.4	9.3	-0.3
Independent, lean Rep.	11.4	11.5	11.6	0.1	11.8	0.3	11.9	0.4
Not very strong Rep.	12.7	12.3	15.1	2.8	14.7	2.4	14.4	2.1
Strong Republican	15.9	16.2	18.2	2.0	19.4	3.2	16.8	0.6
Other/apolitical/DK	1.4	1.5	1.0	-0.5	1.2	-0.3	1.1	-0.4
Post-election characteristics in 2006 Pilot Study								
Bush approval in 2006 (V06P790)								
Approve	—	—	28.0	—	28.6	—	27.4	—
Disapprove	—	—	56.7	—	56.2	—	56.8	—
Neither	—	—	14.7	—	14.6	—	15.3	—
DK/refused	—	—	0.6	—	0.5	—	0.5	—
Voted in 2006 (V06P775x)								
Yes	—	—	76.1	—	76.5	—	73.7	—
No	—	—	23.9	—	23.5	—	26.3	—
DK/refused/not sure	—	—	0.0	—	0.0	—	0.0	—
Party ID (V06P680)								
Strong Democrat	—	—	25.0	—	25.1	—	26.7	—
Not very strong Dem.	—	—	15.4	—	15.1	—	16.2	—
Independent, lean Dem.	—	—	11.6	—	11.5	—	11.0	—
Independent	—	—	5.9	—	5.4	—	6.5	—
Independent, lean Rep.	—	—	8.9	—	9.3	—	8.6	—
Not very strong Rep.	—	—	12.3	—	12.2	—	11.7	—
Strong Republican	—	—	19.6	—	20.2	—	18.1	—
Other/apolitical/ref.	—	—	1.3	—	1.1	—	1.3	—

— Not applicable.
Note: Differences between estimates in 2004 and 2006 are an indication of the extent of nonresponse bias attributable to the combination of unit nonresponse and item nonresponse. Item nonresponse rates are very low for most items, so the bulk of any differences is attributable to unit nonresponse. 2004 estimates include 1,212 cases because the 2004 weight has not been recalculted to account for the removal of one case (ID 357) determined during the 2006 ANES Pilot Study data collection to be
Source: 2004 National Election Study and 2006 ANES Pilot Study (datasets).

The 2006 midterm election turnout estimate of 74 percent greatly exceeds the true parameter (estimated to be 40 percent[4]) and reinforces the need, already recognized by ANES, to develop more accurate measures of turnout.

The party identification distribution (54 percent Democrats or Democratic leaners), 7 percent pure independents, and 38 percent Republicans or Republican leaners)) is consistent with recent results from the Pew Center for the People and the Press which estimated 52 percent Democrats (including leaners) and 36 percent Republicans (including leaners) (Pew 2007).

6.5. Computing Sampling Errors

Conventional calculations of sampling errors (also known as standard errors) are based upon an assumption of simple random sampling that does not apply to any ANES study or, indeed, to any survey conducted using clustering, stratification, oversampling, or other common survey methods that result in unequal probabilities of selection. Because ANES does not use simple random sampling, *sampling errors must be calculated using methods that account for the complex sample design of the ANES*.

The Taylor Series method is an appropriate technique to calculate sampling errors for a complex-sample survey such as ANES. Also, a rough approximation of correct sampling errors can be made by adjusting the simple random standard error by the root design effect (DEFT). This section discusses both methods.

Taylor Series

The Taylor series method is a computationally efficient way to estimate standard errors in complex-sample surveys. For information about the statistical theory behind the method, see Groves et al. (2004), Kish (1965), and Skinner, Holt, and Smith (1989). In addition to analysis weights (variable V06P002 in the Pilot), Taylor series calculations rely on two variables, a stratum and a cluster (often the Primary Sampling Unit). In the 2006 ANES Pilot Study, these variables are V06P007a and V06P007b, respectively.

Several statistical software applications can use this method, including Stata, SUDAAN, AM, SAS, and SPSS. Stata, SUDAAN, and AM are designed to provide broad support for complex samples. SAS provides more limited support for this method (with the survey procedures SURVEYMEANS, SURVEYFREQ, SURVEYREG, and SURVEYLOGISTIC), and SPSS can account for complex samples when the Complex Samples module is used. The applications do not always make Taylor series calculations identically, but when differences appear they are usually negligible. See the respective software documentation for instructions in the use of Taylor series in a particular

---

[4] We estimate the turnout rate for the population represented by the Pilot Study as follows: 85.7 million total votes cast divided by a population that consists of 214.0 million age-eligible citizens. This population excludes those in prison and those overseas, but includes those on probation, on parole, and vote-ineligible felons, because these groups were not excluded from the ANES sample. Source: http://elections.gmu.edu/Turnout_2006G.html, accessed November 5, 2008.

application. Information on these applications can be obtained as follows. Stata: www.stata.com. SUDAAN: www.rti.org. AM (which is in a beta version and is free): am.air.org. SAS: www.sas.com. SPSS: www.spss.com/complex_samples.

Approximate Standard Errors

A *design effect* (DEFF) is the ratio of the variance obtained under an actual sample design to the variance that would be obtained under simple random sampling (Kish 1965). In practice (with some exceptions for stratified sample designs), complex sampling methods produce greater variance than would be produced by simple random samples, so design effects in complex-sample surveys are greater than 1. Thus simple-random standard errors overstate the precision of estimates and their use would lead to type-1 errors (i.e., false rejection of the null hypothesis, or false positives) in the analysis of complex-sample survey data.

A technique to minimize these errors is to adjust the standard errors to reflect the average design effect. The Taylor series method described above is recommended when its use is practical, but if users cannot apply the Taylor series to their analyses, the following approximation technique is better than ignoring design effects.

The average design effect (DEFF) of the 2006 ANES Pilot study is approximately 1.82. This average is based on 53 statistics for 12 variables often of interest to analysts of ANES data (shown in Table 7), and the average may differ for other selections of variables. The root design effect (DEFT), or square root of the design effect, is the ratio of the standard error obtained under the actual sample design to the standard error that would be obtained under simple random sampling. The average root design effect of the Pilot is approximately 1.35.

To obtain approximately accurate standard errors from standard statistical procedures that assume simple random sampling, use the DEFF to adjust the weight as follows. Calculate a new weight variable equal to the analysis weight (V06P002) divided by the DEFF (1.82). When analyses are conducted using the new weight, the resulting standard errors and significance tests based on simple-random-sample procedures and frequency weighting will in most cases be more accurate than such statistics computed without a design effect adjustment (under an erroneous simple random sample assumption). However, each statistic properly has a unique design effect associated with it, so the adjustment by the average design effect is only an approximation.

(Note that this adjustment procedure is appropriate for studies that have an analysis weight scaled to the sample size, so the average weight is 1 and the sum of the weights equals the sample size. The procedure described above rescales the weight to sum to the *effective* sample size, which is $675/1.82 = 371$. For studies that scale the weight to the population size, so the sum of the weights equals the population, weights would need to be re-scaled prior to applying this procedure. All ANES studies to date have scaled the weights to the sample size.)

Reference Table of Estimates and their Standard Errors Calculated by Selected Methods

Table 7 provides percentage estimates and their standard errors calculated in five different ways to illustrate the differences between the selected methods. The "SRS, unweighted" columns present estimates and standard errors based on simple-random-sample assumptions. Analysts should *not* use this method to calculate statistics with the ANES Pilot Study dataset. The estimates are presented here for comparison to the other methods. The "SRS, weighted" columns present weighted percentage estimates and standard errors based on simple-random-sample assumptions. The remaining three columns present the same weighted percentage estimates – illustrating that methods of computing standard errors do not affect these estimates – with standard errors calculated in three different ways, and showing the design effects of each method in comparison to the simple-random-sample standard errors. The "Adjusted weight" column's standard errors were calculated after dividing the weight variable (V06P002) by the study's average design effect (1.82), inflating each standard error by a factor of 1.35. The "Design-consistent, with published strata" columns present Taylor-series estimates of standard errors. This is the method that should generally be used for analyses of the Pilot Study data whenever feasible. Data users may wish to replicate estimates from this table before undertaking their own analyses, to assure that they are calculating parameter estimates and standard errors correctly. The "Design-consistent, with modified strata" column presents estimates after strata have been collapsed to permit calculation of standard errors for three sets of estimates on the second page of Table 7 that could not be calculated using the standard method because subsetting the data led to empty clusters. See the notes to Table 7 for a description of the modification to the strata.

Design-consistent standard errors were calculated using the Taylor series method in Intercooled Stata 9.2.

Table 7. Estimated percentages, standard errors, and root design effects from the 2006 ANES Pilot Study, calculated by alternative methods

Characteristic	SRS, unweighted		SRS, weighted		Adjusted weight			Design-consistent, with published strata			Design-consistent, with modified strata		
	Percent	s.e.	Percent	s.e.	Percent	s.e.	DEFT	Percent	s.e.	DEFT	Percent	s.e.	DEFT
Age (recode v043250)													
18-29	14.8	1.37	20.7	1.56	20.7	2.10	1.35	20.7	2.51	1.61	20.7	2.50	1.60
30-39	12.3	1.26	16.2	1.42	16.2	1.91	1.35	16.2	2.40	1.69	16.2	2.42	1.71
40-49	22.7	1.61	21.8	1.59	21.8	2.14	1.35	21.8	2.20	1.38	21.8	2.32	1.46
50-59	21.6	1.59	17.5	1.46	17.5	1.97	1.35	17.5	1.49	1.02	17.5	1.41	0.96
60-69	17.0	1.45	11.1	1.21	11.1	1.63	1.35	11.1	1.25	1.03	11.1	1.29	1.07
70 or older	11.6	1.23	12.6	1.28	12.6	1.72	1.35	12.6	2.87	2.25	12.6	2.88	2.25
Sex (v041109a)													
Male	46.1	1.92	46.8	1.92	46.8	2.59	1.35	46.8	2.45	1.28	46.8	2.45	1.28
Female	53.9	1.92	53.2	1.92	53.2	2.59	1.35	53.2	2.45	1.28	53.2	2.45	1.28
Race (recode v043299a)													
Black	10.5	1.16	11.2	1.21	11.2	1.64	1.35	11.2	1.85	1.52	11.2	1.76	1.45
Asian	2.5	0.60	2.5	0.60	2.5	0.81	1.35	2.5	0.48	0.80	2.5	0.51	0.85
Native American	0.7	0.33	0.5	0.27	0.5	0.37	1.35	0.5	0.29	1.07	0.5	0.29	1.07
Hispanic	3.7	0.73	4.2	0.77	4.2	1.04	1.35	4.2	1.16	1.50	4.2	1.11	1.44
White	78.5	1.59	76.7	1.63	76.7	2.20	1.35	76.7	1.94	1.19	76.7	1.99	1.22
Other, refused, or don't know	4.4	0.79	4.8	0.82	4.8	1.11	1.35	4.8	1.00	1.22	4.8	1.07	1.30
Education (recode V043254)													
Less than high school diploma	5.2	0.85	14.4	1.35	14.4	1.82	1.35	14.4	3.29	2.43	14.4	3.34	2.47
High school diploma/equiv.	25.3	1.68	31.4	1.79	31.4	2.41	1.35	31.4	3.13	1.75	31.4	3.19	1.79
Some college	32.9	1.81	28.5	1.74	28.5	2.34	1.35	28.5	2.05	1.18	28.5	2.11	1.21
Bachelor's degree or higher	36.6	1.86	25.6	1.68	25.6	2.27	1.35	25.6	2.30	1.37	25.6	2.21	1.32
Household income (recode V043293x)													
Under $20,000	12.7	1.28	14.9	1.37	14.9	1.85	1.35	14.9	1.97	1.44	14.9	1.96	1.43
$20,000-$39,999	18.2	1.49	18.0	1.48	18.0	1.99	1.35	18.0	1.93	1.31	18.0	1.78	1.20
$40,000-$59,999	16.9	1.44	15.1	1.38	15.1	1.86	1.35	15.1	1.71	1.24	15.1	1.59	1.15
$60,000-$79,999	15.0	1.37	16.3	1.42	16.3	1.92	1.35	16.3	1.76	1.24	16.3	1.74	1.22
$80,000-$119,999	16.1	1.42	15.8	1.40	15.8	1.89	1.35	15.8	1.61	1.15	15.8	1.46	1.04
$120,000 or more	12.4	1.27	11.0	1.20	11.0	1.62	1.35	11.0	1.59	1.32	11.0	1.36	1.13
Missing, refused, or don't know	8.6	1.08	8.8	1.09	8.8	1.47	1.35	8.8	1.22	1.12	8.8	1.22	1.12
Voter turnout 2006 (v06p775x)													
Voted	76.1	1.64	73.7	1.69	73.7	2.29	1.35	73.7	2.11	1.25	73.7	2.01	1.19
Did not vote	23.9	1.64	26.3	1.69	26.3	2.29	1.35	26.3	2.11	1.25	26.3	2.01	1.19
Voter turnout 2004 (recode v045018x)													
Voted	86.8	1.33	83.9	1.45	83.9	1.95	1.35	83.9	2.26	1.56	83.9	2.33	1.61
Did not vote	13.2	1.33	16.1	1.45	16.1	1.95	1.35	16.1	2.26	1.56	16.1	2.33	1.61
Vote in 2004 (v045026)													
John Kerry	46.6	2.13	48.4	2.13	48.4	2.87	1.35	48.4	3.97	1.87	48.4	3.83	1.80
George W. Bush	52.4	2.13	50.2	2.13	50.2	2.87	1.35	50.2	3.87	1.82	50.2	3.77	1.77
Ralph Nader	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.00	—	0.0	0.00	—	0.0	0.00	—
Other	1.1	0.44	1.4	0.50	1.4	0.67	1.35	1.4	0.80	1.60	1.4	0.80	1.60
Party ID (recode v06p680)													
Strong Democrat	25.0	1.67	26.7	1.70	26.7	2.30	1.35	26.7	2.81	1.65	26.7	2.80	1.64
Not very strong Dem.	15.4	1.39	16.2	1.42	16.2	1.91	1.35	16.2	2.00	1.41	16.2	1.95	1.38
Independent, lean Dem.	11.6	1.23	11.0	1.20	11.0	1.62	1.35	11.0	1.37	1.14	11.0	1.30	1.08
Independent	5.9	0.91	6.5	0.95	6.5	1.28	1.35	6.5	1.14	1.20	6.5	1.15	1.21
Independent, lean Rep.	8.9	1.10	8.6	1.08	8.6	1.46	1.35	8.6	1.12	1.04	8.6	1.15	1.07
Not very strong Rep.	12.3	1.26	11.7	1.24	11.7	1.67	1.35	11.7	1.06	0.86	11.7	1.07	0.86
Strong Republican	19.6	1.53	18.1	1.48	18.1	2.00	1.35	18.1	1.70	1.15	18.1	1.63	1.10
Other/apolitical/DK/refused	1.3	0.44	1.3	0.44	1.3	0.59	1.35	1.3	0.57	1.31	1.3	0.57	1.31
Bush approval (v06p790)													
Approve	28.0	1.73	27.4	1.72	27.4	2.32	1.35	27.4	1.95	1.14	27.4	1.92	1.12
Disapprove	56.7	1.91	56.8	1.91	56.8	2.57	1.35	56.8	2.51	1.32	56.8	2.53	1.33
Neither approve nor disap.	14.7	1.36	15.3	1.39	15.3	1.87	1.35	15.3	1.69	1.22	15.3	1.75	1.26
Refused	0.6	0.30	0.5	0.27	0.5	0.37	1.35	0.5	0.31	1.14	0.5	0.31	1.14

Table continues. See notes at end of table.

Table 7. Estimated percentages, standard errors, and root design effects from the 2006 ANES Pilot Study, calculated by alternative methods—*continued*

Characteristic	SRS, unweighted Percent	s.e.	SRS, weighted Percent	s.e.	Adjusted weight Percent	s.e.	DEFT	Design-consistent, with published strata Percent	s.e.	DEFT	Design-consistent, with modified strata Percent	s.e.	DEFT
Trust in government (v06p656)													
Always	0.9	0.61	0.7	0.55	0.7	0.74	1.35	0.7	—	—	0.7	0.54	0.98
Most of the time	18.2	2.54	15.3	2.37	15.3	3.20	1.35	15.3	—	—	15.3	2.91	1.23
Aobut half the time	49.4	3.30	54.9	3.27	54.9	4.42	1.35	54.9	—	—	54.9	4.79	1.46
Once in a while	27.3	2.94	24.9	2.85	24.9	3.84	1.35	24.9	—	—	24.9	3.27	1.15
Never	4.3	1.34	4.1	1.30	4.1	1.76	1.35	4.1	—	—	4.1	1.44	1.10
Internal efficacy (v06p653)													
A great deal	8.4	1.53	8.2	1.51	8.2	2.03	1.35	8.2	—	—	8.2	2.27	1.51
A lot	13.6	1.88	13.1	1.85	13.1	2.50	1.35	13.1	—	—	13.1	1.62	0.87
A moderate amount	33.1	2.59	31.5	2.55	31.5	3.44	1.35	31.5	—	—	31.5	3.53	1.38
A little	35.8	2.64	34.9	2.62	34.9	3.53	1.35	34.9	—	—	34.9	4.33	1.66
Not at all	9.0	1.58	12.3	1.80	12.3	2.43	1.35	12.3	—	—	12.3	2.91	1.61
Interest in politics (v06p630)													
Extremely interested	18.2	2.10	15.8	1.98	15.8	2.67	1.35	15.8	—	—	15.8	2.05	1.04
Very interested	39.4	2.65	38.6	2.64	38.6	3.56	1.35	38.6	—	—	38.6	5.44	2.06
Moderately interested	33.2	2.56	34.5	2.58	34.5	3.48	1.35	34.5	—	—	34.5	4.67	1.81
Slightly interested	8.5	1.52	10.1	1.63	10.1	2.20	1.35	10.1	—	—	10.1	2.35	1.44
Not interested at all	0.3	0.29	0.9	0.51	0.9	0.69	1.35	0.9	—	—	0.9	0.92	1.80
Refused	0.3	0.29	0.2	0.24	0.2	0.33	1.35	0.2	—	—	0.2	0.21	0.87
Interpersonal trust (v06p519)													
Always	1.5	0.66	1.3	0.62	1.3	0.83	1.35	1.3	0.55	0.89	1.3	0.55	0.89
Most of the time	46.9	2.71	41.7	2.68	41.7	3.61	1.35	41.7	4.26	1.59	41.7	4.31	1.61
About half the time	31.6	2.53	34.9	2.59	34.9	3.49	1.35	34.9	4.06	1.57	34.9	4.05	1.56
Once in a while	18.0	2.09	19.1	2.13	19.1	2.88	1.35	19.1	3.09	1.45	19.1	3.01	1.41
Never	1.8	0.72	2.9	0.91	2.9	1.23	1.35	2.9	1.70	1.87	2.9	1.72	1.89
Refused	0.3	0.29	0.1	0.17	0.1	0.23	1.35	0.1	0.10	0.58	0.1	0.10	0.58
Importance of religion (v06p552)													
Important	73.9	1.69	73.8	1.69	73.8	2.28	1.35	73.8	2.69	1.59	73.8	2.72	1.61
Not important	25.9	1.69	26.1	1.69	26.1	2.28	1.35	26.1	2.69	1.59	26.1	2.71	1.60
Refused	0.1	0.15	0.1	0.12	0.1	0.16	1.35	0.1	0.09	0.74	0.1	0.09	0.74

Notes: — Statistic cannot be calculated by standard techniques.
"SRS, unweighted" estimates are calculated assuming simple random sampling, without weights. This method is not recommended.
"SRS, weighted" estimates are calculated assuming simple random sampling, weighted by v06p002. This method of calculating standard errors is not recommended.
"Adjusted weight" estimates are calculated with v06p002 adjusted by the average design effect (v06p002/1.82), reducing the effective sample size, and using the simple-random-sample formula for sampling error. This method may be useful in some circumstances, but the Taylor-series method for calculating design-consistent estimates is preferred.
"Design consistent, with published strata" estimates are weighted by v06p002 and use Taylor series standard errors based on stratum and cluster variables v06p007a and v06p007b. This method is recommended.
"Design consistent, with modified strata" estimates are weighted by v06p002 and use Taylor series standard errors based on collapsed strata to eliminate empty clusters. Each of the variables v06p656 (trust in government), v06p653 (efficacy), and v06p630 (interest in politics) had unique empty cells in the stratum x cluster matrix. To make one modification that would permit all calculations to be run, the stratum code (v06p007a) was collapsed as follows: 1&2, 4&5, 6&7, 8&9, and 20&21, respectively, were collapsed into single strata.
"DEFT" is the square root of the design effect (DEFF). Each DEFT equals the s.e. in the adjacent column divided by the s.e. in the "SRS, weighted" column. DEFT calculations are subject to rounding error.
Source: 2006 ANES Pilot Study.

References

Allison, P.D. (2002). *Missing Data*. Sage University Papers Series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, 07-136. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

The American Association for Public Opinion Research. (2006). *Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates Surveys*. 4th edition. Lenexa, KS: AAPOR.

Beatty, P.C., and Willis, G.B. (2007). The Practice of Cognitive Interviewing. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *71*, 287-311.

de Leeuw, E., Callegaro, M., Hox, J., Korendijk, E, and Lensvelt-Mulders, G. (2007). The Influence of Advance Letters on Response in Telephone Surveys. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *71*, 413-443.

Groves, R., Fowler, F., Couper, M., Lepkowski, J., Singer, E., and Tourangeau, R. (2004). *Survey Methodology*. New York: Wiley.

Heeringa, S.G., Connor, J. H., Haeussler, J.S., Redmond, G.B., and Samonte, J.E. (1994). *1990 SRC National Sample: Design and Development*. Unpublished manuscript, Survey Research Center Sampling Section, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.

Kish, L. (1965). *Survey Sampling*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Pew Research Center for the People & the Press. (2007). *2007 Values Update Survey Final Topline*. Online (retrieved July 9, 2007) at http://people-press.org/reports/questionnaires/312.pdf

Skinner, C.J., Holt, D., and Smith, T.M.F. (1989). *Analysis of Complex Surveys*. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons.

Appendix A: Telephone Cognitive Interview Script and "Think Aloud Probes" Reference Sheet for Interviewer

This appendix contains the script read to cognitive interview participants at the beginning of each cognitive interview, as well as the probe reference sheet kept handy by the interviewer during interviews.

Before we begin, I want to mention that I will be speaking very slowly in our conversation. The reason for that, is that I will be reading you some very complicated information, and I want to make it easier for you to understand and to give you plenty of time to think about what I'm saying.

I just want you to know that this interview will be completely confidential. By this I mean that nothing from this interview will have your name on it or any other indicator that could trace it back to you. Any record of this interview will refer to you by a number only.

In this interview, I will be reading you questions and asking you to answer each one. I will ask you one question at time, and you can answer each one out loud. To save me the trouble of having to write all your answers down, I'd like to ask whether it would be ok with you to tape record the conversation. That way, I can listen to the tape later and think about your answers. Is that ok?

When you listen to each question, I'd like to ask you to do something in addition to just giving me your answer. It would be most helpful if you would <u>think out loud</u> in two ways. After you hear each question, first please restate the question in your own words. We want to learn about how you interpret the questions I will ask you, and one good way to do that is for us to see how you restate the ideas in the question but using <u>different</u> words that express the same meaning to you.

Second, we'd like to learn about how you come up with your answer to each question. To learn about how you're thinking, after you restate the meaning of each question, please say out loud as many of your thoughts as you can while you are thinking about how to answer each question.

That way, I can get a sense of how you're <u>interpreting</u> each question and how you <u>decide</u> on your answers.

If you forget to restate the question, or to think out loud, I'll remind you. Ok?

Because this kind of thinking aloud is probably not something you're used to doing, it might be helpful for you to get a little practice at doing it. So, let me give you an example.

Imagine that I ask you: "How many windows are there in your home?"

If I asked you this, you would first have to decide what I'm asking you to do. So let me repeat the question and ask you to restate it in your own words. "How many windows are there in your house?"

[RESPONDENT ANSWERS]

[IF R DOES NOT REPEAT VERBATIM] Great. Thanks.

[IF R REPEATS VERBATIM] Let me point something out to you. When you restated the question, you used the same words that I used. So, for example, I said "How many" and you said "How many." I said "windows" and you said "windows." But in order for me to understand how you interpret each question, I need you to say the question back to me using different words. So, let me repeat the question one more time and see if you can repeat it back to me in different words.

"How many windows are there in your home?"

[If R cannot/has problems with this] Let me give you an example of how I could do this. Here's a restatement of the question in my own words: "Would you please count up the number of pieces of glass permanently installed in the walls, doors, or ceiling in the building in which you usually sleep?" So you see how I used different words to express everything? Like instead of saying "home," I said "the building in which you usually sleep." That's what I would need you to do for each question I ask you today, so I can find out how you interpret each one. Does that make sense?

Now, if I asked you that question, and you were going to answer it, you would probably have to mentally walk through your house, picture all the windows, and count them up. And you could do that and then simply tell me the result. So you might just say "10".

But for this interview, we really need to know all of the thoughts that go through your mind as you're interpreting each question and coming up with your answer. It doesn't help us very much just to know the answer without knowing how you thought about the question and how you got your answer. So just saying "10" to answer the question about windows wouldn't help us much.

[NEXT] To give you some practice at thinking out loud, could you please tell me everything you're thinking and seeing in your mind as you mentally walk through your house and count up the windows.

That was great! Thanks! Now, did that seem comfortable to you?

Do you have any questions about how to do this?

[IF BASEMENT OR ATTIC NOT MENTIONED] Do you have a basement or attic?

[IF FORGOT BASEMENT OR ATTIC] It's natural to forget some things like the basement or attic sometimes, but I'd be really grateful if you are willing to think carefully about each question and give me accurate and complete information. There may be some cases when you don't know the exact answer to a question. When this happens, it would be most helpful if you would tell me you're unsure and tell me what you're unsure about. Then, it would be best for you to generate your best guess of the answer and tell me about

how you came up with that answer. Feel free to take as much time as you need to think about each question, and if it would be helpful to you, I can reread any question to you again if you like.

[IF R DID NOT FORGET] One last thing I want to tell you is this: It is very important that you think carefully about each question and give me accurate and complete information. There may be some cases when you don't know the exact answer to a question. When this happens, it would be most helpful if you would tell me you're unsure and tell me what you're unsure about. Then, it would be best for you to generate your best guess of the answer and tell me about how you came up with that answer. Feel free to take as much time as you need to think about each question, and if it would be helpful to you, I can reread any question to you again if you like.

Great. Now that you've got the hang of this, I'd like you to think about the questions I will ask you in the same way. After I read each question, please restate the question in your own words, and then tell me everything you're thinking as you're deciding what you answer will be. Ok?

Before we get started, do you have any [other] questions?

Think Aloud Probes

Think out loud.

Restate the question in your own words.

General Probes

Let me reread the question to you and ask you to tell me please how you would restate that question in different words?

Let me reread the question to you and ask you to tell me please how you would restate that question in your own words?

In your own words, what is that question asking you?

Could you tell me what you thought about when getting to your answer to that question?

What were you thinking about when you were coming up with your answer to that question?

What do you mean by XX?

Can you tell me more about XX?

What went on in your mind as you were answering that question?

Could you tell me a little more about what you were thinking as you were answering that question.

"Don't know" Probe

It would be most helpful if you could do the best you can at generating an answer to this question, and to think aloud while doing it.

Even if you don't know the exact answer to the question, it would be most helpful if you could try to answer the question as best you can, and if you could think aloud while doing it.

Appendix B: CATI Programming Specifications

This appendix presents the questionnaire programming specifications that were used to create the CATI program. Although these specifications describe exactly how most questions were asked, note that these specifications are not the canonical record of the questionnaire; for that, see the 2006 Pilot Study questionnaire file and the *CATI Program Code Annex to the Methodology Report for the 2006 ANES Pilot Study*, both on the ANES web site (www.electionstudies.org).

2006 Pilot Study of the American National Election Studies
Questionnaire, 9 November 2006

NOTES FOR SRBI

1. We will separately furnish timing points so we can get item or section timings.

2. Bracketed text is not read to respondent. Text in all caps is not read to respondent. Response code numbers are not read to respondent. Text in parentheses is read to respondent only if in lower-case, indicating a fill for CATI to select automatically. Some text is underlined for emphasis. Response options in the column in all caps, outside of the question stem, are never read to respondents.

3. DON'T KNOW and REFUSED responses should be available as volunteered responses to all questions. For a few items, other responses are also listed as "(VOL)" or "(VOLUNTEERED)."   These responses are never read to respondents.

4. Item numbers: Question item numbers start with Q, followed by the number of the proposal that was the source of the question, followed by number of the item. E.g. Q1-2-40 is question 40 in section 1-2. Skip instructions start with S.

5. Flow: Start at INTRO1. Where there is no GO TO instruction, go to the next item in the list. Otherwise, go to the item named in the GO TO instruction. (Items are not numbered in the order they are to be asked.)

6. R means "respondent," i.e. the person who must be interviewed at each household. "INFORMANT" means anyone who answers the telephone who is not the respondent.

7A. Whenever there is a reference to the State of Washington, be sure the fill reads "the state of Washington," not just "Washington." Other states (except New York; see 7B below) can fill with just the state name (e.g., "Florida"). To identify R's state, use V041202 (FIPS) or V041201a (POSTAL ABBR) from the public use data file of the 2004 ANES. If R moved, update from STATE item following INTRO4.

7B. Whenever there is a reference to the state of New York, be sure the fill reads "the state of New York" and not just "New York." Other state names (except Washington; see 7A above) can fill with just the state name (e.g., "Florida"). To identify R's state, use V041202 (FIPS) or V041201a (POSTAL ABBR) from the public use data file of the 2004 ANES. If R moved, update from STATE item following INTRO4.

8. Payment note: Anyone who starts an interview is entitled to be paid. The R may terminate an in-progress interview at any point and still get a check, but unless the R specifically requests payment for a partial interview, we should call them back to try to complete the interview before sending a check. Each R should be offered the largest amount that the R has previously been offered.

9. Please assign half the respondents to receive the response orders presented in the questionnaire; the other half of respondents should receive the reversed order for selected items with unipolar rating scales. To determine response choice order, there should be one randomization decision per respondent, so each R either gets positive-negative and most-least, or always gets negative-positive and least-most.

For example, the first item in the list, Q2-13-10, is presented as follows:

Q2-13-10   First, how much do you think people can change the kind of person they are? Completely, a lot, a moderate amount, a little, or not at all?
> *COMPLETELY   1*
> *A LOT   2*
> *A MODERATE AMOUNT   3*
> *A LITTLE   4*
> *NOT AT ALL   5*
> *DON'T KNOW   8*
> *REFUSED   9*

For half the respondents, the response order should be reversed, as follows:

Q2-13-10r   First, how much do you think people can change the kind of person they are? Not at all, a little, a moderate amount, a lot, or completely?

Please create a flag variable that indicates the order in which the responses were presented to each respondent.

Please contact me with any questions about this. Please reverse the response order for half the sample for the following items (with a few new additions in **boldface**):

Q2-13-10	Q5-12-30	**Q4-2-240**	Q2-9-40	Q4-9-70
Q5-8-10	Q4-8-10	**Q4-2-250**	Q2-9-50	Q3-9-10
Q5-7-10	Q4-2-140	Q3-12-30	Q4-5-20	Q3-9-20
Q5-7-50	Q4-2-150	Q3-12-50	Q4-5-30	Q3-9-30
Q5-7-55	Q4-2-160	QNET20	Q4-5-50	Q3-9-40
Q5-7-70	Q4-2-170	QNET100	Q4-5-60	Q3-9-60
Q5-7-80	Q4-2-180	QNET260	Q4-5-70	Q3-9-70
Q5-7-90	Q4-2-190	Q1-9-10	Q4-5-80	Q3-9-80
QJUSTICE	Q4-2-200	Q1-9-20	Q4-9-40	Q3-9-90
Q5-12-10	Q4-2-210	Q1-9-30	Q4-9-50	**QDEATH**
Q5-12-20	Q4-2-220	Q1-9-50	Q4-9-60	Q2-16-10
	Q4-2-230	Q2-9-20		

10. Please make a variable and record the decision at every place where randomization or rotation occurs. This will help with data cleaning.

11. Don't Know protocol: if R says Don't Know, the interviewer should wait 4 seconds and then probe: "I'll make a note of that. It would be a big help to us if you'd be willing to give me your best guess." Then repeat the question. If the respondent still says DK, the interviewer can enter DK as the response and go to the next question. Please provide interviewers a tack-up sheet with this instruction.

12. On the data file, please identify the interviewer by an ID number that is unique to each interviewer working on the study. This should not be an employee ID; it should be an anonymous identifier.

QUESTIONNAIRE

INTRO1   Hi, my name is (INTERVIEWER'S FIRST AND LAST NAME), and I am calling from SRBI on behalf of the University of Michigan and Stanford University. Can I speak with (R'S FIRST AND LAST NAME) please?

R SPEAKING	1	(GO TO RESP)
R AVAILABLE	2	(GO TO INTRO2)
R NOT AVAILABLE NOW	3	(GO TO NOTAV)
NO ONE HERE BY THAT NAME	4	(GO TO NOONE)

NOTAV   I'll try again at another time; thanks for your help. [END INTERVIEW]

SCHEDULE CALLBACK	1	(SCHEDULE CALLBACK)

		CALLBACK AT NO SPECIFIC TIME	2 (TERMINATE)

NOONE   Do you happen to know how I can contact (R'S FIRST AND LAST NAME)?

	YES	1 (GO TO REFER)
	YES, BUT CALL BACK FOR THE INFO	2 (SCHEDULE CALLBACK)
	NO, NEVER HEARD OF R	3 (GO TO END2)
	NO, HEARD OF R BUT NO CONTACT INFO	4 (GO TO END2)
	REFUSED	9 (GO TO END2)

REFER   Could you please tell me (his/her) address and phone number so we can contact (him/her)?

TEXT ADDRESS _____

TEXT ADDRESS _____

NUMBER PHONE ___-___-____

INTRO 2   READ WHEN THE PERSON WHO ANSWERED THE PHONE HAS GIVEN THE PHONE TO THE RESPONDENT WHO MUST BE INTERVIEWED:

Hi, is this (R'S FIRST NAME)?

My name is (INTERVIEWER'S FIRST AND LAST NAME), and I am calling from SRBI on behalf of the University of Michigan and Stanford University.

RESP   I'm calling first to thank you for helping us 2 years ago when you were kind enough to be interviewed for the 2004 American National Election Study survey. We recently sent you a letter letting you know that we're hoping to speak with you one last time. We would like to learn what you're thinking these days. We are able to offer you (20/50) dollars as a thank-you for your help in doing this interview, which lasts about 45 minutes on average and is often shorter. Do you remember receiving a letter about this recently?

	YES	1 (GO TO INTRO3)
	NO	5 (GO TO CONSENT)

CONSENT   I'm sorry you haven't gotten to see the letter yet. Before we start, I just want to mention that the interview is voluntary and confidential. As I mentioned, we can offer you (20/50) dollars as a thank-you for your time being interviewed. If I ask a question that you prefer not to answer, just let me know that. You can stop the interview any time without losing any benefit to which you are already entitled. If you have questions about your participation, I can give you a telephone number you can call.

INTRO3   Just to be sure, let me confirm that you are (R'S FIRST AND LAST

NAME), you were born on (R'S BIRTH DATE), and you are (R'S SEX).
Is that all right?

INSTRUCTION: IF INFORMATION IS EXACTLY THE SAME, CODE
YES. CODE "CLOSE ENOUGH" IF NAME IS BASICALLY THE
SAME, BIRTH YEAR IS WITHIN PLUS OR MINUS TWO YEARS,
AND SEX IS THE SAME. OTHERWISE CODE NO.

YES	1	(GO TO STATE)
NO	5	(GO TO INTRO4)
CLOSE ENOUGH	6	(GO TO STATE)

INTRO4   Hmm. Let me check that.

RECORD NEWLY REPORTED INFORMATION AND ANY OTHER
RELEVANT INFORMATION ABOUT THE CASE.

_____

The information in my computer is different. I hope it's ok with you if I
let you go now and check with my supervisor, and then we'll give you a
call back later. Thanks a lot for your time today.
            SCHEDULE A CALLBACK TIME IF R WISHES TO DO SO.
TERMINATE AND CALL BACK LATER.

STATE   And just to confirm, are you still living in (R'S STATE OF
RESIDENCE), or are you living in a different state?

STILL LIVING IN STATE	1
DIFFERENT STATE [RECORD STATE]	2

BEGIN   Great, we can start now. (IF SELECTED FOR RECORDING, READ:
Just to let you know, I need to record this interview for quality control, so
I am going to start the tape now.)
NOTE: IF R QUESTIONS TAPE RECORDING, EXPLAIN THAT IT IS
FOR QUALITY CONTROL, SO THAT THE PEOPLE WHO WROTE
THE SURVEY CAN HEAR HOW IT WORKS. IF R REFUSES TO BE
RECORDED, SAY "OK, then I won't record this interview." AND DO
NOT RECORD THE INTERVIEW.

I'd like to begin with some general questions about you and your opinions
about other people.

[*SECTION 2-13: CHARACTER JUDGMENTS*]

Q2-13-10   First, how much do you think people can change the kind of person they
are? Completely, a lot, a moderate amount, a little, or not at all?

COMPLETELY	1
A LOT	2

```
                  A MODERATE AMOUNT   3
                  A LITTLE            4
                  NOT AT ALL          5
                  DON'T KNOW          8
                  REFUSED             9
```

[*SECTION 5-8: DEFENSIVE CONFIDENCE*]

Q5-8-10   If you wanted to defend an opinion of yours, how successfully do you
            think you could do that? Extremely successfully, very successfully,
            moderately successfully, slightly successfully, or not successfully at all?

```
                  EXTREMELY SUCCESSFULLY    1
                  VERY SUCCESSFULLY         2
                  MODERATELY SUCCESSFULLY   3
                  SLIGHTLY SUCCESSFULLY     4
                  NOT SUCCESSFULLY AT ALL   5
                  DON'T KNOW                8
                  REFUSED                   9
```

[*SECTION 5-7: NEED FOR CLOSURE*]

Q5-7-10   How disorganized are the rooms that you personally live and work in
            most? Extremely disorganized, very disorganized, moderately
            disorganized, slightly disorganized, or not disorganized at all?

```
                  EXTREMELY DISORGANIZED    1
                  VERY DISORGANIZED         2
                  MODERATELY DISORGANIZED   3
                  SLIGHTLY DISORGANIZED     4
                  NOT DISORGANIZED AT ALL   5
                  DON'T KNOW                8
                  REFUSED                   9
```

Q5-7-40   Do you like unpredictable situations, dislike them, or neither like nor
            dislike them?

```
                  LIKE                        1  (GO TO Q5-7-50)
                  DISLIKE                     2  (GO TO Q5-7-55)
                  NEITHER LIKE NOR DISLIKE    3  (GO TO Q5-7-60)
                  DON'T KNOW                  8  (GO TO Q5-7-60)
                  REFUSED                     9  (GO TO Q5-7-70)
```

Q5-7-50   Do you like unpredictable situations a great deal, a moderate amount, or a
            little?

```
                  A GREAT DEAL        1
                  A MODERATE AMOUNT   2
                  A LITTLE            3
                  DON'T KNOW          8
```

REFUSED		9

S5-7-52   GO TO Q5-7-70.

Q5-7-55   Do you dislike unpredictable situations a great deal, a moderate amount,
or a little?

A GREAT DEAL	1
A MODERATE AMOUNT	2
A LITTLE	3
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

S5-7-57   GO TO Q5-7-70.

Q5-7-60   Do you lean toward liking unpredictable situations, lean toward disliking
unpredictable situations, or do you not lean either way?

LEAN TOWARD LIKING	1
LEAN TOWARD DISLIKING	2
DO NOT LEAN EITHER WAY	3
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q5-7-70   How many of your important decisions do you make both quickly and
confidently? All, most, about half, a few, or none?

ALL	1
MOST	2
ABOUT HALF	3
A FEW	4
NONE	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q5-7-80   When you don't understand the reason why something happens in your
life, how uncomfortable does that make you feel? Extremely
uncomfortable, very uncomfortable, moderately uncomfortable, slightly
uncomfortable, or not uncomfortable at all?

EXTREMELY UNCOMFORTABLE	1
VERY UNCOMFORTABLE	2
MODERATELY UNCOMFORTABLE	3
SLIGHTLY UNCOMFORTABLE	4
NOT UNCOMFORTABLE AT ALL	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q5-7-90   Of the situations when you see two people disagreeing with one another, in how many of them can you see how both people could be right? All of them, most of them, about half of them, a few of them, or none of them?

ALL	1
MOST	2
ABOUT HALF	3
A FEW	4
NONE	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

[*SECTION JUSTICE: BELIEF IN A JUST WORLD*]

QJUSTICE   How much of the time do people get what they deserve in life? Always, most of the time, about half the time, once in a while, or never?

ALWAYS	1
MOST OF THE TIME	2
ABOUT HALF THE TIME	3
ONCE IN A WHILE	4
NEVER	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

[*SECTION 5-12: SELF MONITORING*]

S5-12-5   SPLIT SAMPLE: A RANDOM HALF OF THE RESPONDENTS GO TO Q5-12-10, AND THE OTHER HALF GO TO Q5-12-40.

Q5-12-10   When you're with other people, how often do you put on a show to impress or entertain them? Always, most of the time, about half the time, once in a while, or never?

ALWAYS	1
MOST OF THE TIME	2
ABOUT HALF THE TIME	3
ONCE IN A WHILE	4
NEVER	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q5-12-20   How good or bad of an actor would you be? Excellent, good, fair, poor, or very poor?

EXCELLENT	1
GOOD	2
FAIR	3
POOR	4

VERY POOR	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q5-12-30   When you're in a group of people, how often are you the center of attention? Always, most of the time, about half the time, once in while, or never?

ALWAYS	1
MOST OF THE TIME	2
ABOUT HALF THE TIME	3
ONCE IN A WHILE	4
NEVER	5
(VOL) NEVER IN GROUPS OF PEOPLE	6
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

S5-12-35   GO TO NEXT SECTION AFTER 5-12.

Q5-12-40   The following statements concern your personal reactions to a number of different situations. No two statements are exactly alike, so please consider each statement carefully before answering. If a statement is true or mostly true as applied to you, answer true. If a statement is false or not usually true as applied to you, answer false.

I guess I put on a show to impress or entertain people.

TRUE	1
FALSE	2
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q5-12-50   I would probably make a good actor.

TRUE	1
FALSE	2
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q5-12-60   In groups of people, I am rarely the center of attention.

TRUE	1
FALSE	2
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

[*SECTION 4-8: TRUST*]

S4-8-5   SPLIT SAMPLE: HALF GO TO Q4-8-10 AND HALF GO TO Q4-8-20.

Q4-8-10   Generally speaking, how often can you trust other people? Always, most
            of the time, about half the time, once in a while, or never?
                        ALWAYS   1
                        MOST OF THE TIME   2
                        ABOUT HALF THE TIME   3
                        ONCE IN A WHILE   4
                        NEVER   5
                        DON'T KNOW   8
                        REFUSED   9

Q4-8-11   What percent of people can you trust all of the time?
            PROBE FOR PERCENT FROM 0 TO 100.
                        PERCENT ____
                        DON'T KNOW   8888
                        REFUSED   9999

Q4-8-12   What percent of people can you never trust at all?
            PROBE FOR PERCENT FROM 0 TO 100.
                        PERCENT ____
                        DON'T KNOW   8888
                        REFUSED   9999

S4-8-15.   GO TO NEXT SECTION AFTER 4-8.

Q4-8-20.   Generally speaking, would you say that most people <u>can be trusted</u>, or that
            you <u>can't be too careful</u> in dealing with people?
                        MOST PEOPLE CAN BE TRUSTED   1
                        CAN'T BE TOO CAREFUL   2
                        DON'T KNOW   8
                        REFUSED   9

[*SECTION 4-2: VALUES*]

S4-2-10   SPLIT SAMPLE: HALF GO TO Q4-2-20 AND HALF GO TO Q4-2-140.

Q4-2-20   Next, I will describe some people. Please tell me how much each person is
            or is not like you. Very much like you, like you, somewhat like you, a
            little like you, not like you, or not like you at all?

[NOTE: FILLS FOR THE ITEMS 4-2-30 THROUGH 4-2-120 SHOULD BE "HE" FOR
MALE RESPONDENTS AND "SHE" FOR FEMALE RESPONDENTS, BASED ON
2004 DATA.]

Q4-2-30   First, (he/she) thinks it is important that every person in the world be
            treated equally. (He/She) believes everyone should have equal
            opportunities in life. Is this person very much like you, like you,

somewhat like you, a little like you, not like you, or not like you at all?

VERY MUCH LIKE YOU	1
LIKE YOU	2
SOMEWHAT LIKE YOU	3
A LITTLE LIKE YOU	4
NOT LIKE YOU	5
NOT LIKE YOU AT ALL	6
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q4-2-40   It is important to (him/her) to live in secure surroundings. (He/She) avoids anything that might endanger (his/her) safety.
IF NECESSARY, READ: Is this person very much like you, like you, somewhat like you, a little like you, not like you, or not like you at all?

VERY MUCH LIKE YOU	1
LIKE YOU	2
SOMEWHAT LIKE YOU	3
A LITTLE LIKE YOU	4
NOT LIKE YOU	5
NOT LIKE YOU AT ALL	6
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q4-2-50   (He/She) looks for adventures and likes to take risks. (He/she) wants to have an exciting life.
IF NECESSARY, READ: Is this person very much like you, like you, somewhat like you, a little like you, not like you, or not like you at all?

VERY MUCH LIKE YOU	1
LIKE YOU	2
SOMEWHAT LIKE YOU	3
A LITTLE LIKE YOU	4
NOT LIKE YOU	5
NOT LIKE YOU AT ALL	6
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q4-2-60   Tradition is important to (him/her). (He/She) tries to follow the customs handed down by (his/her) religion or (his/her) family. IF NECESSARY, READ: Is this person very much like you, like you, somewhat like you, a little like you, not like you, or not like you at all?

VERY MUCH LIKE YOU	1
LIKE YOU	2
SOMEWHAT LIKE YOU	3
A LITTLE LIKE YOU	4
NOT LIKE YOU	5
NOT LIKE YOU AT ALL	6

Q4-2-70   (He/She) seeks every chance (he/she) can to have fun. It is important to (him/her) to do things that give (him/her) pleasure.
IF NECESSARY, READ: Is this person very much like you, like you, somewhat like you, a little like you, not like you, or not like you at all?

VERY MUCH LIKE YOU	1
LIKE YOU	2
SOMEWHAT LIKE YOU	3
A LITTLE LIKE YOU	4
NOT LIKE YOU	5
NOT LIKE YOU AT ALL	6
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q4-2-80   (He/She) believes that people should do what they're told. (He/She) thinks people should follow rules at all times, even when no one is watching.
IF NECESSARY, READ: Is this person very much like you, like you, somewhat like you, a little like you, not like you, or not like you at all?

VERY MUCH LIKE YOU	1
LIKE YOU	2
SOMEWHAT LIKE YOU	3
A LITTLE LIKE YOU	4
NOT LIKE YOU	5
NOT LIKE YOU AT ALL	6
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q4-2-90   Being very successful is important to (him/her). (He/She) hopes people will recognize (his/her) achievements.
IF NECESSARY, READ: Is this person very much like you, like you, somewhat like you, a little like you, not like you, or not like you at all?

VERY MUCH LIKE YOU	1
LIKE YOU	2
SOMEWHAT LIKE YOU	3
A LITTLE LIKE YOU	4
NOT LIKE YOU	5
NOT LIKE YOU AT ALL	6
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q4-2-100   Next, it's very important to (him/her) to help the people around (him/her). (He/She) wants to care for their well-being. IF NECESSARY, READ: Is this person very much like you, like you, somewhat like you, a little like you, not like you, or not like you at all?

VERY MUCH LIKE YOU	1
LIKE YOU	2
SOMEWHAT LIKE YOU	3
A LITTLE LIKE YOU	4
NOT LIKE YOU	5
NOT LIKE YOU AT ALL	6
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q4-2-110   It is important to (him/her) to be in charge and tell others what to do. (He/She) wants people to do what (he/she) says.
IF NECESSARY, READ: Is this person very much like you, like you, somewhat like you, a little like you, not like you, or not like you at all?

VERY MUCH LIKE YOU	1
LIKE YOU	2
SOMEWHAT LIKE YOU	3
A LITTLE LIKE YOU	4
NOT LIKE YOU	5
NOT LIKE YOU AT ALL	6
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q4-2-120   It is important to (him/her) to make (his/her) own decisions about what (he/she) does. (He/She) likes to be free and not depend on others.
IF NECESSARY, READ: Is this person very much like you, like you, somewhat like you, a little like you, not like you, or not like you at all?

VERY MUCH LIKE YOU	1
LIKE YOU	2
SOMEWHAT LIKE YOU	3
A LITTLE LIKE YOU	4
NOT LIKE YOU	5
NOT LIKE YOU AT ALL	6
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

S4-2-130   GO TO NEXT SECTION AFTER 4-2.

Q4-2-140   The next few questions are about how important things are to you.

First, how important is it to you that every person in the world have the same opportunities in life? Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	1
VERY IMPORTANT	2
MODERATELY IMPORTANT	3
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT	4

NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q4-2-150   How important is it to you that you feel safe from harm?
IF NECESSARY, READ RESPONSE OPTIONS: Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	1
VERY IMPORTANT	2
MODERATELY IMPORTANT	3
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT	4
NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q4-2-160   How important is it to you that you have an exciting life?
IF NECESSARY, READ RESPONSE OPTIONS: Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	1
VERY IMPORTANT	2
MODERATELY IMPORTANT	3
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT	4
NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q4-2-170   How important is it to you that you follow traditions?
IF NECESSARY, READ RESPONSE OPTIONS: Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	1
VERY IMPORTANT	2
MODERATELY IMPORTANT	3
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT	4
NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q4-2-180   How important is it to you that you have fun whenever you can?
IF NECESSARY, READ RESPONSE OPTIONS: Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	1

VERY IMPORTANT	2
MODERATELY IMPORTANT	3
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT	4
NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q4-2-190   How important is it to you that people always follow rules?
IF NECESSARY, READ RESPONSE OPTIONS: Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	1
VERY IMPORTANT	2
MODERATELY IMPORTANT	3
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT	4
NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q4-2-200   How important is it to you that you are very successful?
IF NECESSARY, READ RESPONSE OPTIONS: Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	1
VERY IMPORTANT	2
MODERATELY IMPORTANT	3
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT	4
NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q4-2-210   How important is it to you that you help other people?
IF NECESSARY, READ RESPONSE OPTIONS: Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	1
VERY IMPORTANT	2
MODERATELY IMPORTANT	3
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT	4
NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q4-2-220   How important is it to you that you be in charge of other people who do what you tell them to do?
IF NECESSARY, READ RESPONSE OPTIONS: Extremely important,

very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important
at all?

EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	1
VERY IMPORTANT	2
MODERATELY IMPORTANT	3
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT	4
NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q4-2-230   How important is it to you that you choose what you do in your life?
IF NECESSARY, READ RESPONSE OPTIONS: Extremely important,
very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important
at all?

EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	1
VERY IMPORTANT	2
MODERATELY IMPORTANT	3
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT	4
NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q4-2-240   Earlier I asked you how important it is to you to be very successful. Now
I'd like to ask you about two different kinds of success separately. Being
successful financially, and being successful at getting other people's
respect for your achievements.

First, how important is it to you that you be financially successful?
Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly
important, or not important at all?

EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	1
VERY IMPORTANT	2
MODERATELY IMPORTANT	3
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT	4
NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q4-2-250   Now, how important is it to you that you be successful at getting other
people's respect for your achievements?
Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly
important, or not important at all?

EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	1
VERY IMPORTANT	2
MODERATELY IMPORTANT	3
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT	4

NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

[*SECTION 4-13: BORROWING*]

Q4-13-10   If you really needed to borrow money, could you borrow money from a family member or a close friend?

YES	1	(GO TO Q4-13-20)
NO	2	(GO TO NEXT SECTION)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO NEXT SECTION)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO NEXT SECTION)

Q4-13-20   What is the largest <u>total</u> amount of money that you could borrow from all family members and close friends combined?
IF NEEDED, PROBE, What would be your best guess?

ANY AMOUNT	1	(GO TO Q4-13-25)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO NEXT SECTION)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO NEXT SECTION)

Q4-13-25   ENTER LARGEST AMOUNT R COULD BORROW FROM ALL FAMILY MEMBERS AND CLOSE FRIENDS COMBINED.
     ENTER NUMBER $ _ _ _ _ _ _ _
     [RANGE 1 TO 9,999,999]

[*SECTION 2-18: SOCIOTROPIC VOTING*]

Q2-18-10   What is your best guess of the average price of a gallon of regular unleaded gasoline across all of (R'S STATE) today?
IF R RESPONDS DK: What would be your best guess?
ROUND UP TO NEAREST CENT.
     PRICE _ _ . _ _ [DOLLARS AND CENTS] [RANGE 01.00 TO 9.99]

DON'T KNOW	00.08
REFUSED	00.09

Q2-18-20   During a typical week, how many days do you drive an automobile?

NUMBER OF DAYS _ [RANGE 0-7]	
DON'T KNOW	888
REFUSED	999

Q2-18-30   During a typical week, how many times do you notice the price of gasoline in your area?

ENTER NUMBER _ _ _ [RANGE 0 – 100]	
DON'T KNOW	888
REFUSED	999

Q2-18-40   [CATI FILL INSTRUCTIONS FOR Q2-18-40: Fill month as September for interviews conducted from October 7 through November 3; fill as October from November 4 through Dec 8; fill as November from Dec 9 through Jan 5; fill as December from January 6 through February 3]

Of the adults in (R'S STATE) who wanted to work during the second week of (MONTH), what percent of them would you guess were unemployed and looking for a job?

ENTER NUMBER _ _ . _ [RANGE 0.0 – 99.9]
DON'T KNOW   8888
REFUSED   9999

[*SECTION REL: RELIGION*]

QREL10   Do you consider religion to be an <u>important</u> part of your life, or <u>not</u>?
IMPORTANT   1 (GO TO QREL20)
NOT IMPORTANT 2 (GO TO QREL30)
DON'T KNOW   8 (GO TO QREL30)
REFUSED   9 (GO TO QREL30)

QREL20   Would you say your religion provides <u>some</u> guidance in your day-to-day living, <u>quite a bit</u> of guidance, or <u>a great deal</u> of guidance in your day-to-day living?
SOME   1
QUITE A BIT   2
A GREAT DEAL   3
DON'T KNOW   8
REFUSED   9

QREL30   Lots of things come up that keep people from attending religious services even if they want to. Thinking about your life these days, do you ever attend religious services, apart from occasional weddings, baptisms, or funerals?
YES   1 (GO TO QREL40)
NO   5 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)
DON'T KNOW   8 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)
REFUSED   9 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)

QREL40   Do you go to religious services every week, almost every week, once or twice a month, a few times a year, or never?
EVERY WEEK   1 (GO TO QREL50)
ALMOST EVERY WEEK   2 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)
ONCE OR TWICE A MONTH   3 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)

A FEW TIME A YEAR	4 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)
NEVER	5 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)
DON'T KNOW	8 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)
REFUSED	9 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)

QREL50   Would you say you go to religious services once a week, or more often than once a week?

ONCE A WEEK	1
MORE OFTEN THAN ONCE A WEEK	2
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

[*SECTION 3-12: CHRISTIANITY*]

S3-12-10   IF R IDENTIFIED AS CHRISTIAN IN 2004 (I. E., IF 2004 PRE-ELECTION INTERVIEW VARIABLE V043247=1 OR V043247=2 OR V043247=3), GO TO Q3-12-20. ELSE, GO TO NEXT SECTION.

Q3-12-20   Do you believe that Jesus Christ is the son of God, or do you believe that Jesus Christ is not the son of God?

IS SON OF GOD	1 (GO TO Q3-12-30)
NOT SON OF GOD	2 (GO TO Q3-12-40)
DON'T KNOW	8 (GO TO Q3-12-40)
REFUSED	9 (GO TO Q3-12-40)

Q3-12-30   How important is this belief to you personally? Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	1
VERY IMPORTANT	2
MODERATELY IMPORTANT	3
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT	4
NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q3-12-40   Do you believe that for the people who take Holy Communion, the bread and wine become the body and blood of Jesus Christ, or do you believe that does not happen?

YES, DOES HAPPEN	1 (GO TO Q3-12-50)
NO, DOES NOT HAPPEN	5 (GO TO Q3-12-60)
DON'T KNOW	8 (GO TO Q3-12-60)
REFUSED	9 (GO TO Q3-12-60)

Q3-12-50   How important is this belief to you personally? Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	1
VERY IMPORTANT	2
MODERATELY IMPORTANT	3
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT	4
NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q3-12-60   Have there been times in your life when you tried to be a good Christian, or is that not something you have tried to do?

YES, HAVE BEEN TIMES	1 (GO TO Q3-12-70)
NO, NOT TRIED TO DO	5 (GO TO Q3-12-100)
DON'T KNOW	8 (GO TO Q3-12-100)
REFUSED	9 (GO TO Q3-12-100)

Q3-12-70   When you have tried to be a good Christian, which did you try to do more: avoid doing sinful things yourself, or help other people?
            PROBE: Which did you try to do more?

AVOID SIN	1 (GO TO Q3-12-100)
HELP OTHERS	2 (GO TO Q3-12-80)
DON'T KNOW	8 (GO TO Q3-12-100)
REFUSED	9 (GO TO Q3-12-100)

Q3-12-80   When you have tried to be a good Christian, did you mostly try to help other people one at a time, or did you mostly join with groups of people who were helping many others all at once?

ONE AT A TIME	1
MANY AT ONCE	2
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q3-12-100   Do you believe that God gave people the responsibility to protect the natural environment, or that God gave people the right to use the environment however they choose, even if doing so does not protect the environment?
            PROBE: Which is closer to your view?

RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT	1
RIGHT TO USE	2
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

[*SECTION 5-2: OPTIMISM/PESSIMISM*]

S5-2-10   SPLIT SAMPLE, HALF GO TO Q5-2-20 AND HALF GO TO Q5-2-110.

Q5-2-20   When you think about your future, are you generally optimistic, pessimistic, or neither optimistic nor pessimistic?

OPTIMISTIC	1	(GO TO Q5-2-30)
PESSIMISTIC	2	(GO TO Q5-2-40)
NEITHER OPTIMISTIC NOR PESSIMISTIC	3	(GO TO Q5-2-50)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO Q5-2-50)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO Q5-2-60)

Q5-2-30   Are you extremely optimistic, moderately optimistic, or slightly optimistic?

EXTREMELY OPTIMISTIC	1	(GO TO Q5-2-60)
MODERATELY OPTIMISTIC	2	(GO TO Q5-2-60)
SLIGHTLY OPTIMISTIC	3	(GO TO Q5-2-60)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO Q5-2-60)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO Q5-2-60)

Q5-2-40   Are you extremely pessimistic, moderately pessimistic, or slightly pessimistic?

EXTREMELY PESSIMISTIC	1	(GO TO Q5-2-60)
MODERATELY PESSIMISTIC	2	(GO TO Q5-2-60)
SLIGHLTY PESSIMISTIC	3	(GO TO Q5-2-60)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO Q5-2-60)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO Q5-2-60)

Q5-2-50   Do you lean toward being optimistic, lean toward being pessimistic, or do you not lean either way?

LEAN TOWARD BEING OPTIMISTIC	1
LEAN TOWARD BEING PESSIMISTIC	2
DO NOT LEAN EITHER WAY	3
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q5-2-60   And when you think about the future of the United States as a whole, are you generally optimistic, pessimistic, or neither optimistic nor pessimistic?

OPTIMISTIC	1	(GO TO Q5-2-70)
PESSIMISTIC	2	(GO TO Q5-2-80)
NEITHER	3	(GO TO Q5-2-90)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO Q5-2-90)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO S5-2-100)

Q5-2-70   Are you extremely optimistic, moderately optimistic, or slightly optimistic?

EXTREMELY OPTIMISTIC	1	(GO TO S5-2-100)

MODERATELY OPTIMISTIC	2	(GO TO S5-2-100)
SLIGHTLY OPTIMISTIC	3	(GO TO S5-2-100)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO S5-2-100)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO S5-2-100)

Q5-2-80   Are you extremely pessimistic, moderately pessimistic, or slightly pessimistic?

EXTREMELY PESSIMISTIC	1	(GO TO S5-2-100)
MODERATELY PESSIMISTIC	2	(GO TO S5-2-100)
SLIGHTLY PESSIMISTIC	3	(GO TO S5-2-100)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO S5-2-100)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO S5-2-100)

Q5-2-90   Do you lean toward being optimistic, lean toward being pessimistic, or do you not lean either way?

LEAN TOWARD BEING OPTIMISTIC	1
LEAN TOWARD BEING PESSIMISTIC	2
DO NOT LEAN EITHER WAY	3
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

S5-2-100   GO TO NEXT SECTION AFTER 5-2.

Q5-2-110   When you think about your own personal future, are you generally optimistic, pessimistic, or neither optimistic nor pessimistic?

OPTIMISTIC	1	(GO TO Q5-2-120)
PESSIMISTIC	2	(GO TO Q5-2-130)
NEITHER OPTIMISTIC		
NOR PESSIMISTIC	3	(GO TO Q5-2-140)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO Q5-2-140)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO Q5-2-150)

Q5-2-120   Are you very optimistic, or somewhat optimistic?

VERY OPTIMISTIC	1	(GO TO Q5-2-150)
SOMEWHAT OPTIMISTIC	2	(GO TO Q5-2-150)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO Q5-2-150)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO Q5-2-150)

Q5-2-130   Are you very pessimistic, or somewhat pessimistic?

VERY PESSIMISTIC	1	(GO TO Q5-2-150)
SOMEWHAT PESSIMISTIC	2	(GO TO Q5-2-150)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO Q5-2-150)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO Q5-2-150)

Q5-2-140   Do you lean toward being optimistic, lean toward being pessimistic, or do you not lean either way?

LEAN TOWARD BEING OPTIMISTIC	1
LEAN TOWARD BEING PESSIMISTIC	2
DO NOT LEAN EITHER WAY	3
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q5-2-150   And when you think about the future of the United States as a whole, are you generally optimistic, pessimistic, or neither optimistic nor pessimistic?

OPTIMISTIC	1	(GO TO Q5-2-160)
PESSIMISTIC	2	(GO TO Q5-2-170)
NEITHER OPTIMISTIC NOR PESSIMISTIC	3	(GO TO Q5-2-180)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO Q5-2-180)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO NEXT SECT.)

Q5-2-160   Are you very optimistic, or somewhat optimistic?

VERY OPTIMISTIC	1	(GO TO NEXT SECT.)
SOMEWHAT OPTIMISTIC	2	(GO TO NEXT SECT.)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO NEXT SECT.)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO NEXT SECT.)

Q5-2-170   Are you very pessimistic, or somewhat pessimistic?

VERY PESSIMISTIC	1	(GO TO NEXT SECT.)
SOMEWHAT PESSIMISTIC	2	(GO TO NEXT SECT.)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO NEXT SECT.)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO NEXT SECT.)

Q5-2-180   Do you lean toward being optimistic, lean toward being pessimistic, or do you not lean either way?

LEAN TOWARD OPTIMISTIC	1	(GO TO NEXT SECT.)
LEAN TOWARD PESSIMISTIC	2	(GO TO NEXT SECT.)
DO NOT LEAN	3	(GO TO NEXT SECT.)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO NEXT SECT.)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO NEXT SECT.)

[*SECTION NET: SOCIAL NETWORK*S]

QNET10   [FILL INSTRUCTION: For QNET10, half of Rs get fills for "important things" and half get "government and elections." Record which fill each R gets.]

During the last six months, did you talk with anyone face-to-face, on the phone, by email, or in any other way about (things that were important to you/ government and elections), or did you not do this with anyone during the last six months?

YES, DID TALK	1	
NO, DID NOT TALK	5	(GO TO NEXT SECTION)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO NEXT SECTION)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO NEXT SECTION)

QNET15   What are the initials of the people who you talked with face-to-face, on the phone, by email, or in any other way during the past six months, about (things that were important to you /government and elections)?
[RECORD UP TO 10 NAMES]
[INTERVIEWER, DO NOT ENTER TWO IDENTICAL NAMES. IF THE SAME NAME IS OFFERED TWICE, PROBE: "You gave the same name / initials twice. If you meant to refer to a different person the second time, please give that person a different name or initial."]
AFTER EACH NAME, ASK/CONFIRM SEX.
AFTER EACH NAME, PROBE "Who else?" UNTIL UNPRODUCTIVE OR THREE NAMES ARE ENTERED.

NAME1 _____ SEX _
NAME2 _____ SEX _
NAME3 _____ SEX _
NAME4 _____ SEX _
NAME5 _____ SEX _
NAME6 _____ SEX _
NAME7 _____ SEX _
NAME8 _____ SEX _
NAME9 _____ SEX _
NAME10 _____ SEX _

[IN CATI, CODE SEX AS 1, 2, 8, OR 9 FOR MALE, FEMALE, DON'T KNOW, AND REFUSED]

QNET20   [ASK FOR THE FIRST THREE NAMES MENTIONED IN QNET15]

How close do you feel to (NAME FROM QNET15)? Extremely close, very close, moderately close, slightly close, or not close at all?

EXTREMELY CLOSE	1
VERY CLOSE	2
MODERATELY CLOSE	3
SLIGHTLY CLOSE	4
NOT CLOSE AT ALL	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

QNET30   [ASK FOR THE FIRST THREE NAMES MENTIONED IN QNET15]

During the last six months, about how many days did you talk to (NAME)?

NUMBER OF DAYS GIVEN   1
            NUMBER ___ [RANGE 0-185]
FREQUENCY GIVEN   2
    SPECIFY NUMBER PER WEEK OR MONTH
        _____ PER _____
EVERY DAY   3
DON'T KNOW   888
REFUSED   999

SNET35   IF ONE PERSON WAS MENTIONED AT QNET15, GO TO QNET100. IF TWO PEOPLE MENTIONED AT QNET15, GO TO QNET40. IF THREE OR MORE PEOPLE MENTIONED, GO TO QNET70.

QNET40   Please think about the relations between the two people you mentioned. During the last six months, about how many days would you guess they talked to each other?
NUMBER OF DAYS GIVEN   1
            NUMBER ___ [RANGE 0-185]
FREQUENCY GIVEN   2
    SPECIFY NUMBER PER WEEK OR MONTH
        _____ PER _____
EVERY DAY   3
NEVER   4
OTHER, SPECIFY _____   5
DON'T KNOW   888
REFUSED   999

SNET60   GO TO QNET100.

QNET70.   [REPEAT QNET70 FOR EACH APPLICABLE PAIR OF THE FIRST THREE NAMES MENTIONED IN QNET15: 1&2, 1&3, 2&3. FILL "NAME" BELOW AS APPROPRIATE FOR EACH PAIRING]

FIRST TIME QNET70 IS DISPLAYED: Please think about the relations between these people. First, think about (NAME) and (NAME).

SUBSEQUENT TIMES QNET70 IS DISPLAYED: Now think about (NAME) and (NAME).

During the last six months, about how many days would you guess they talked to each other?
NUMBER OF DAYS GIVEN   1
            NUMBER ___ [RANGE 0-185]
FREQUENCY GIVEN   2
    SPECIFY NUMBER PER WEEK OR MONTH
        _____ PER _____

EVERY DAY	3
NEVER	4
OTHER, SPECIFY _____	5
DON'T KNOW	888
REFUSED	999

SNET95 SEE QNET70 FOR REPEAT INSTRUCTIONS. IF NO FURTHER REPEATS ARE NECESSARY, GO TO QNET100.

QNET100 [ASK FOR EACH NAME MENTIONED IN QNET15.]
In general, how different are (NAME)'s opinions about government and elections from your own views? Extremely different, very different, moderately different, slightly different, or not different at all?

EXTREMELY DIFFERENT	1
VERY DIFFERENT	2
MODERATELY DIFFERENT	3
SLIGHTLY DIFFERENT	4
NOT DIFFERENT AT ALL	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

 [BEGIN PARTY ID SEQUENCE]

SNET200 SPLIT: HALF OF RESPONDENTS GO TO QNET210 AND HALF GO TO QNET215. FILL NAME BELOW WITH NAME FROM QNET15 AND REPEAT THE PARTY ID SEQUENCE FOR THE FIRST THREE NAMES GIVEN IN QNET15.

QNET210 Generally speaking, does (NAME) probably think of (himself/herself) as a Democrat, Republican, Independent, or what?

DEMOCRAT	1	(GO TO QNET220)
REPUBLICAN	2	(GO TO QNET240)
INDEPENDENT	3	(GO TO QNET250)
OTHER	4	(GO TO QNET250)
NO PREFERENCE	5	(GO TO QNET250)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO QNET250)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO SNET255)

QNET215 Generally speaking, does (NAME) probably think of (himself/herself) as a Republican, Democrat, Independent, or what?

REPUBLICAN	1	(GO TO QNET240)
DEMOCRAT	2	(GO TO QNET220)
INDEPENDENT	3	(GO TO QNET250)
OTHER	4	(GO TO QNET250)
NO PREFERENCE	5	(GO TO QNET250)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO QNET250)

REFUSED   9 (GO TO SNET255)

[PROGRAMMING NOTE: FILLS FOR THE ITEMS BELOW ARE BASED ON SEX REPOTED AT QNET15. IF SEX WAS NOT REPORTED, FILL WITH "he or she" and "himself or herself" AS APPROPRIATE.]

QNET220   Would (he/she) call (himself/herself) a strong Democrat or a not very strong Democrat?

STRONG	1	(GO TO SNET255)
NOT VERY STRONG	2	(GO TO SNET255)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO SNET255)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO SNET255)

QNET240   Would (he/she) call (himself/herself) a strong Republican or a not very strong Republican?

STRONG	1	(GO TO SNET255)
NOT VERY STRONG	2	(GO TO SNET255)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO SNET255)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO SNET255)

QNET250   Does (he/she think) of (himself/herself) as closer to the Democratic Party or the Republican Party?

CLOSER TO DEMOCRATIC	1	(GO TO SNET255)
CLOSER TO REPUBLICAN	3	(GO TO SNET255)
NEITHER (VOLUNTEERED)	5	(GO TO SNET255)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO SNET255)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO SNET255)

SNET255   [END PARTY ID SEQUENCE. REPEAT IF NECESSARY. SEE SNET200 FOR REPEAT INSTRUCTION.]

QNET260   [FILL NAME BELOW WITH NAME FROM QNET15. REPEAT THE QUESTION FOR THE FIRST THREE NAMES MENTIONED IN QNET15.]

How interested is (NAME) in information about what's going on in government and politics? Extremely interested, very interested, moderately interested, slightly interested, or not interested at all?

EXTREMELY INTERESTED	1
VERY INTERESTED	2
MODERATELY INTERESTED	3
SLIGHTLY INTERESTED	4
NOT INTERESTED AT ALL	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

QNET500   [FILL NAME BELOW WITH NAME FROM QNET15. REPEAT
           QNET500 FOR THE FIRST THREE NAMES MENTIONED IN
           QNET15.]

           How much time would it take to drive from your home to (NAME)'s
           home?
                   TIME GIVEN   1
                        MIN___ HOURS___ DAYS___
                        OTHER, SPECIFY _____ (GO TO NEXT SECT.)
                   (VOL) CAN'T DRIVE THERE   2 (GO TO QNET510)
                   (VOL) LIVES WITH (NAME)   3 (GO TO NEXT SECT.)
                   DON'T KNOW   888 (GO TO NEXT SECT.)
                   REFUSED   999 (GO TO NEXT SECT.)

QNET510   How many miles would you guess it is from your home to (NAME)'s
           home?
                   NUMBER _____
                   DON'T KNOW   88888
                   REFUSED   99999

[*SECTION 1-9, ATTENTION TO POLITICS*]

S1-9-05   SPLIT SAMPLE: HALF GO TO Q1-9-10 AND HALF GO TO Q1-9-40.

Q1-9-10   How interested are you in information about what's going on in
           government and politics? Extremely interested, very interested,
           moderately interested, slightly interested, or not interested at all?
                   EXTREMELY INTERESTED   1
                   VERY INTERESTED   2
                   MODERATELY INTERESTED   3
                   SLIGHTLY INTERESTED   4
                   NOT INTERESTED AT ALL   5
                   DON'T KNOW   8
                   REFUSED   9

Q1-9-20   How closely do you pay attention to information about what's going on in
           government and politics? Extremely closely, very closely, moderately
           closely, slightly closely, or not closely at all?
                   EXTREMELY CLOSELY   1
                   VERY CLOSELY   2
                   MODERATELY CLOSELY   3
                   SLIGHTLY CLOSELY   4
                   NOT CLOSELY AT ALL   5
                   DON'T KNOW   8

| | REFUSED | 9 |

Q1-9-30   How often do you pay attention to what's going on in government and politics? All the time, most of the time, about half the time, once in a while, or never?

ALL THE TIME	1
MOST OF THE TIME	2
ABOUT HALF THE TIME	3
ONCE IN A WHILE	4
NEVER	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q1-9-35   GO TO THE NEXT SECTION.

Q1-9-40   Some people don't pay much attention to political campaigns. How about you? Would you say that you have been <u>very much</u> interested, <u>somewhat</u> interested, or <u>not much</u> interested in the political campaigns this year?

VERY MUCH INTERESTED	1
SOMEWHAT INTERESTED	2
NOT MUCH INTERESTED	3
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q1-9-50   Some people seem to follow what's going on in government and public affairs most of the time, whether there's an election going on or not. Others aren't that interested. Would you say you follow what's going on in government and public affairs most of the time, some of the time, only now and then, or hardly at all?

MOST OF THE TIME	1
SOME OF THE TIME	2
ONLY NOW AND THEN	3
HARDLY AT ALL	4
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

[*SECTION 2-9, AMBIVALENCE*]

S2-9-05   SPLIT: ASSIGN Rs TO ONE OF FOUR GROUPS AS FOLLOWS: ONE QUARTER TO GROUP=1, ONE QUARTER TO GROUP=2, ONE QUARTER TO GROUP=3, ONE QUARTER TO GROUP=4. IF GROUP=1, GO TO Q2-9-50. IF GROUP=2, GO TO Q2-9-60. IF GROUP=3, GO TO Q2-9-10. IF GROUP=4, GO TO Q2-9-50.

PROGRAMMING NOTE: GROUP 1 WILL BE ASKED ITEM 50

FOLLOWED BY ITEMS 10 THROUGH 40. GROUP 2 WILL BE ASKED ITEMS 60 THROUGH 72 FOLLOWED BY 50. GROUP 3 WILL BE ASKED ITEMS 10 THROUGH 40 FOLLOWED BY 50. GROUP 4 WILL BE ASKED ITEM 50 FOLLOWED BY ITEMS 60 THROUGH 72.

Q2-9-10   You might have favorable thoughts or feelings about the federal government in Washington. Or you might have unfavorable thoughts or feelings about the federal government in Washington. Or you might have some of each.

I would like to ask you first about any favorable thoughts or feelings you might have about the federal government in Washington. Then in a moment, I'll ask you some separate questions about any unfavorable thoughts or feelings you might have.

First, do you have <u>any</u> favorable thoughts or feelings about the federal government in Washington, or do you <u>not</u> have any?

DO HAVE	1	(GO TO Q2-9-20)
DO NOT HAVE	2	(GO TO Q2-9-30)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO Q2-9-30)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO Q2-9-30)

Q2-9-20   How favorable are your favorable thoughts and feelings about the federal government in Washington? Extremely favorable, very favorable, moderately favorable, or slightly favorable?

EXTREMELY FAVORABLE	1
VERY FAVORABLE	2
MODERATELY FAVORABLE	3
SLIGHTLY FAVORABLE	4
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q2-9-30   Do you have <u>any</u> unfavorable thoughts or feelings about the federal government in Washington, or do you <u>not</u> have any?

DO HAVE	1	(GO TO Q2-9-40)
DO NOT HAVE	2	(GO TO Q2-9-50)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO Q2-9-50)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO Q2-9-50)

Q2-9-40   How unfavorable are your unfavorable thoughts and feelings about the federal government in Washington? Extremely unfavorable, very unfavorable, moderately unfavorable, or slightly unfavorable?

EXTREMELY UNFAVORABLE	1
VERY UNFAVORABLE	2
MODERATELY UNFAVORABLE	3

SLIGHTLY UNFAVORABLE	4
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

S2-9-45   IF GROUP=1, GO TO NEXT SECTION. IF GROUP=3, GO TO Q2-9-50. GROUP 2 AND GROUP 4 CANNOT REACH THIS POINT.

Q2-9-50   How conflicting are your thoughts and feelings about the federal government in Washington? Extremely conflicting, very conflicting, moderately conflicting, slightly conflicting, or not conflicting at all?

EXTREMELY CONFLICTING	1
VERY CONFLICTING	2
MODERATELY CONFLICTING	3
SLIGHTLY CONFLICTING	4
NOT CONFLICTING AT ALL	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

S2-9-55   IF GROUP=1, GO TO Q2-9-10. IF GROUP=2, GO TO NEXT SECTION. IF GROUP=3, GO TO NEXT SECTION.   IF GROUP=4, GO TO Q2-9-60.

Q2-9-60   Is there anything in particular that you like about the federal government in Washington?

YES	1 (GO TO Q2-9-65)
NO	2 (GO TO Q2-9-70)
DON'T KNOW	8 (GO TO Q2-9-70)
REFUSED	9 (GO TO Q2-9-70)

Q2-9-65   IF NECESSARY, ASK "What is that?"
PROBE: "Is there anything else you like about the federal government in Washington?" until R says No.
TEXT RESPONSE _____

Q2-9-70   Is there anything in particular that you dislike about the federal government in Washington?

YES	1 (GO TO Q2-9-72)
NO	2 (GO TO S2-9-75)
DON'T KNOW	8 (GO TO S2-9-75)
REFUSED	9 (GO TO S2-9-75)

Q2-9-72   IF NECESSARY, ASK: What is that?
PROBE: "Is there anything else you dislike about the federal government in Washington?" until R says No.
TEXT RESPONSE _____

S2-9-75　　　IF GROUP=2, GO TO S2-9-50. IF GROUP=4, GO TO NEXT
　　　　　　　SECTION. GROUPS 1 AND 3 CANNOT REACH THIS POINT.

[*SECTION 4-5: EFFICACY*]

S4-5-10　　　SPLIT SAMPLE: HALF GO TO Q4-5-20, AND THE OTHER HALF GO
　　　　　　　TO Q4-5-50.

Q4-5-20　　　How much would you say the work and decisions of the President of the
　　　　　　　United States can affect what happens in the United States? A great deal,
　　　　　　　a lot, a moderate amount, a little, or not at all?

A GREAT DEAL	1
A LOT	2
A MODERATE AMOUNT	3
A LITTLE	4
NOT AT ALL	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q4-5-30　　　And how much can the U.S. Congress affect what happens in the United
　　　　　　　States? A great deal, a lot, a moderate amount, a little, or not at all?

A GREAT DEAL	1
A LOT	2
A MODERATE AMOUNT	3
A LITTLE	4
NOT AT ALL	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

S4-5-40　　　GO TO Q4-5-70.

Q4-5-50　　　How much would you say the work and decisions of the President of the
　　　　　　　United States can affect the nation? A great deal, a lot, a moderate amount,
　　　　　　　a little, or not at all?

A GREAT DEAL	1
A LOT	2
A MODERATE AMOUNT	3
A LITTLE	4
NOT AT ALL	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q4-5-60　　　And how much can the U.S. Congress affect the nation? A great deal, a
　　　　　　　lot, a moderate amount, a little, or not at all?

A GREAT DEAL	1
A LOT	2
A MODERATE AMOUNT	3
A LITTLE	4
NOT AT ALL	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q4-5-70   How much would you say the President of the United States can affect how you personally live your life? A great deal, a lot, a moderate amount, a little, or not at all?

A GREAT DEAL	1
A LOT	2
A MODERATE AMOUNT	3
A LITTLE	4
NOT AT ALL	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q4-5-80   And how much can the U.S. Congress affect how you personally live your life? A great deal, a lot, a moderate amount, a little, or not at all?

A GREAT DEAL	1
A LOT	2
A MODERATE AMOUNT	3
A LITTLE	4
NOT AT ALL	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

S4-5-85   SPLIT: HALF GO TO Q4-5-90 AND HALF GO TO Q4-5-120.

Q4-5-90   I'd like to read you a few statements about public life. I'll read them one at a time. Please tell me how strongly you agree or disagree with each of them.

'Public officials don't care much what people like me think.' Do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, neither agree nor disagree, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly?

AGREE STRONGLY	1
AGREE SOMEWHAT	2
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	3
DISAGREE SOMEWHAT	4
DISAGREE STRONGLY	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q4-5-100   'People like me don't have any say about what the government does.' Do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, neither agree nor disagree, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly?

AGREE STRONGLY	1
AGREE SOMEWHAT	2
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	3
DISAGREE SOMEWHAT	4
DISAGREE STRONGLY	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

S4-5-110   GO TO NEXT SECTION.

Q4-5-120   How much do public officials care what people like you think? A great deal, a lot, a moderate amount, a little, or not at all?

A GREAT DEAL	1
A LOT	2
A MODERATE AMOUNT	3
A LITTLE	4
NOT AT ALL	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q4-5-130   How much can people like you affect what the government does? A great deal, a lot, a moderate amount, a little, or not at all?

A GREAT DEAL	1
A LOT	2
A MODERATE AMOUNT	3
A LITTLE	4
NOT AT ALL	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

[*SECTION 4-9: TRUST IN GOVERNMENT*]

S4-9-10   SPLIT SAMPLE INTO THREE RANDOM GROUPS. ONE THIRD GO TO Q4-9-20, ONE THIRD GO TO Q4-9-40, AND ONE THIRD GO TO Q4-9-80.

Q4-9-20   How much of the time do you think you can trust the government in Washington to do what is right? Just about always, most of the time, or only some of the time?

JUST ABOUT ALWAYS	1
MOST OF THE TIME	2
ONLY SOME OF THE TIME	3

NEVER (VOLUNTEERED)	4
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q4-9-30   How much of the time do you think you can trust the government in (R'S STATE) to do what is right? Just about always, most of the time, or only some of the time?

JUST ABOUT ALWAYS	1
MOST OF THE TIME	2
ONLY SOME OF THE TIME	3
NEVER (VOLUNTEERED)	4
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

S4-9-35   GO TO NEXT SECTION AFTER 4-9.

Q4-9-40   How much of the time do you think you can trust the federal government in Washington to make decisions in a fair way? Always, most of the time, about half the time, once in a while, or never?

ALWAYS	1
MOST OF THE TIME	2
ABOUT HALF THE TIME	3
ONCE IN A WHILE	4
NEVER	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q4-9-50   How much of the time do you think you can trust the government in (R'S STATE) to make decisions in a fair way? Always, most of the time, about half the time, once in a while, or never?

ALWAYS	1
MOST OF THE TIME	2
ABOUT HALF THE TIME	3
ONCE IN A WHILE	4
NEVER	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q4-9-60   How much of the time do you think you can trust the federal government in Washington to do what is best for the country? Always, most of the time, about half the time, once in a while, or never?

ALWAYS	1
MOST OF THE TIME	2
ABOUT HALF THE TIME	3
ONCE IN A WHILE	4
NEVER	5

DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q4-9-70   How much of the time do you think you can trust the government in (R'S STATE) to do what is best for (R'S STATE)? Always, most of the time, about half the time, once in a while, or never?

ALWAYS	1
MOST OF THE TIME	2
ABOUT HALF THE TIME	3
ONCE IN A WHILE	4
NEVER	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

S4-9-75   GO TO NEXT SECTION FOLLOWING 4-9.

Q4-9-80   On a scale from 0 to 100, what percent of the time do you think you can trust the federal government in Washington to make decisions in a fair way?

NUMBER _ _ _	[ROUND TO WHOLE NUMBERS, 0-100]
DON'T KNOW	888
REFUSED	999

Q4-9-90   What percent of the time do you think you can trust the government in (R'S STATE) to make decisions in a fair way?

NUMBER _ _ _	[ROUND TO WHOLE NUMBERS, 0-100]
DON'T KNOW	888
REFUSED	999

Q4-9-100   What percent of the time do you think you can trust the federal government in Washington to do what is best for the country?

NUMBER _ _ _	[ROUND TO WHOLE NUMBERS, 0-100]
DON'T KNOW	888
REFUSED	999

Q4-9-110   What percent of the time do you think you can trust the government in (R'S STATE) to do what is best for (R'S STATE)?

NUMBER _ _ _	[ROUND TO WHOLE NUMBERS, 0-100]
DON'T KNOW	888
REFUSED	999

[*SECTION 1-2: MEDIA*]

S1-2-5   SPLIT SAMPLE: HALF GO TO Q1-2-10 AND HALF GO TO Q1-2-90.

Q1-2-10   During a typical week, how many days do you watch or read news on the

Internet, not including sports?
PROBE: IF R REPORTS NO INTERNET ACCESS, PROBE FOR A
NUMBER.
    NUMBER (0-7) __   (IF 0, DK, OR REF, GO TO Q1-2-30)
    DON'T KNOW   8
    REFUSED   9

Q1-2-20   On a typical day when you watch or read the news on the Internet, about
how much time do you spend watching or reading news on the Internet,
not including sports?
    HOURS ___ MIN ___   [SOFT RANGE CHECK AT 2 HOURS]
    DON'T KNOW   88
    REFUSED   99

Q1-2-30   During a typical week, how many days do you read <u>news</u> in a printed
newspaper, not including sports?
    NUMBER (0-7) __   (IF 0, DK, OR REF GO TO Q1-2-50)
    DON'T KNOW   8
    REFUSED   9

Q1-2-40   On a typical day when you read a printed newspaper, about how much
time do you spend reading a newspaper, not including sports?
    HOURS ___ MIN ___   [SOFT RANGE CHECK AT 2 HOURS]
    DON'T KNOW   88
    REFUSED   99

Q1-2-50   During a typical week, how many days do you watch news on TV, not
including sports?
    NUMBER (0-7) __   (IF 0, DK, OR REF GO TO Q1-2-70)
    DON'T KNOW   8
    REFUSED   9

Q1-2-60   On a typical day when you watch TV news, about how much time do you
spend watching news on TV, not including sports?
    HOURS ___ MIN ___   [SOFT RANGE CHECK AT 2 HOURS]
    DON'T KNOW   88
    REFUSED   99

Q1-2-70   During a typical week, how many days do you listen to news on the radio,
not including sports?
    NUMBER (0-7) __   (IF 0, DK, OR REF GO TO NEXT
SECTION)
    DON'T KNOW   8
    REFUSED   9

Q1-2-80   On a typical day when you listen to radio news, about how much time do

you spend listening to news on the radio, not including sports?

HOURS ___ MIN ___ [SOFT RANGE CHECK AT 2 HOURS]
DON'T KNOW 88
REFUSED 99

S1-2-85 GO TO NEXT SECTION.

Q1-2-90 During a typical week in the past year, how many days did you watch or read news on the Internet, not including sports?
PROBE: IF R REPORTS NO INTERNET ACCESS, PROBE FOR A NUMBER.

NUMBER (0-7) ___ (IF 0, DK, OR REF, GO TO Q1-2-110)
DON'T KNOW 8
REFUSED 9

Q1-2-100 On a typical day when you watched or read the news on the Internet in the past year, about how much time did you spend watching or reading news on the Internet, not including sports?

HOURS ___ MIN ___ [SOFT RANGE CHECK AT 2 HOURS]
DON'T KNOW 88
REFUSED 99

Q1-2-110 During a typical week in the past year, how many days did you read <u>news</u> in a printed newspaper, not including sports?

NUMBER (0-7) ___ (IF 0, DK, OR REF GO TO Q1-2-130)
DON'T KNOW 8
REFUSED 9

Q1-2-120 On a typical day when you read a printed newspaper during the last year, about how much time did you spend reading a newspaper, not including sports?

HOURS ___ MIN ___ [SOFT RANGE CHECK AT 2 HOURS]
DON'T KNOW 88
REFUSED 99

Q1-2-130 During a typical week in the past year, how many days did you watch news on TV, not including sports?

NUMBER (0-7) ___ (IF 0, DK, OR REF GO TO Q1-2-150)
DON'T KNOW 8
REFUSED 9

Q1-2-140 On a typical day when you watched TV news during the last year, about how much time did you spend watching news on TV, not including sports?

HOURS ___ MIN ___ [SOFT RANGE CHECK AT 2 HOURS]
DON'T KNOW 88

REFUSED   99

Q1-2-150   During a typical week in the past year, how many days did you listen to news on the radio, not including sports?
        NUMBER (0-7) __ (IF 0, DK, OR REF, GO TO NEXT
                                    SECTION)
        DON'T KNOW   8
        REFUSED   9

Q1-2-160   On a typical day when you listened to news on the radio in the past year, about how much time did you spend listening to news on the radio, not including sports?
        HOURS ___ MIN ___   [SOFT RANGE CHECK AT 2 HOURS]
        DON'T KNOW   88
        REFUSED   99

[*SECTION PID: PARTY IDENTIFICATION*]

SPID10   SPLIT: ONE QUARTER GO TO QPID20, ONE QUARTER GO TO QPID60, ONE QUARTER GO TO QPID100, AND ONE QUARTER GO TO QPID140.

QPID20   Generally speaking, do you think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent, or what?
        REPUBLICAN   1 (GO TO QPID30)
        DEMOCRAT   2 (GO TO QPID40)
        INDEPENDENT   3 (GO TO QPID50)
        OTHER   4 (GO TO QPID50)
        NO PREFERENCE   5 (GO TO QPID50)
        DON'T KNOW   8 (GO TO QPID50)
        REFUSED   9 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)

QPID30   Would you call yourself a strong Republican or a not very strong Republican?
        STRONG   1 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)
        NOT VERY STRONG   2 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)
        DON'T KNOW   8 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)
        REFUSED   9 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)

QPID40   Would you call yourself a strong Democrat or a not very strong Democrat?
        STRONG   1 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)
        NOT VERY STRONG   2 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)
        DON'T KNOW   8 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)
        REFUSED   9 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)

QPID50   Do you think of yourself as closer to the Republican Party or to the Democratic Party?

CLOSER TO REPUBLICAN	1	(GO TO NEXT SECTION)
NEITHER (VOLUNTEERED)	2	(GO TO NEXT SECTION)
CLOSER TO DEMOCRATIC	3	(GO TO NEXT SECTION)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO NEXT SECTION)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO NEXT SECTION)

QPID60   As of today, do you think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent, or what?

REPUBLICAN	1	(GO TO QPID70)
DEMOCRAT	2	(GO TO QPID80)
INDEPENDENT	3	(GO TO QPID90)
OTHER	4	(GO TO QPID90)
NO PREFERENCE	5	(GO TO QPID90)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO QPID90)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO NEXT SECTION)

QPID70   Would you call yourself a strong Republican or a not very strong Republican?

STRONG	1	(GO TO NEXT SECTION)
NOT VERY STRONG	2	(GO TO NEXT SECTION)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO NEXT SECTION)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO NEXT SECTION)

QPID80   Would you call yourself a strong Democrat or a not very strong Democrat?

STRONG	1	(GO TO NEXT SECTION)
NOT VERY STRONG	2	(GO TO NEXT SECTION)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO NEXT SECTION)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO NEXT SECTION)

QPID90   Do you think of yourself as closer to the Republican Party or to the Democratic Party?

CLOSER TO REPUBLICAN	1
NEITHER (VOLUNTEERED)	2
CLOSER TO DEMOCRATIC	3
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

SPID95   GO TO NEXT SECTION.

QPID100   Generally speaking, do you think of yourself as a Democrat, a Republican, an Independent, or what?

DEMOCRAT	1	(GO TO QPID120)
REPUBLICAN	2	(GO TO QPID110)
INDEPENDENT	3	(GO TO QPID130)
OTHER	4	(GO TO QPID130)
NO PREFERENCE	5	(GO TO QPID130)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO QPID130)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO NEXT SECTION)

QPID110   Would you call yourself a strong Republican or a not very strong Republican?

STRONG	1	(GO TO NEXT SECTION)
NOT VERY STRONG	2	(GO TO NEXT SECTION)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO NEXT SECTION)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO NEXT SECTION)

QPID120   Would you call yourself a strong Democrat or a not very strong Democrat?

STRONG	1	(GO TO NEXT SECTION)
NOT VERY STRONG	2	(GO TO NEXT SECTION)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO NEXT SECTION)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO NEXT SECTION)

QPID130   Do you think of yourself as closer to the Democratic Party or to the Republican Party?

CLOSER TO DEMOCRATIC	1	(GO TO NEXT SECTION)
NEITHER (VOLUNTEERED)	2	(GO TO NEXT SECTION)
CLOSER TO REPUBLICAN	3	(GO TO NEXT SECTION)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO NEXT SECTION)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO NEXT SECTION)

QPID140   As of today, do you think of yourself as a Democrat, a Republican, an Independent, or what?

DEMOCRAT	1	(GO TO QPID160)
REPUBLICAN	2	(GO TO QPID150)
INDEPENDENT	3	(GO TO QPID170)
OTHER	4	(GO TO QPID170)
NO PREFERENCE	5	(GO TO QPID170)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO QPID170)

REFUSED   9 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)

QPID150   Would you call yourself a strong Republican or a not very strong
           Republican?
                   STRONG   1 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)
                   NOT VERY STRONG   2 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)
                   DON'T KNOW   8 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)
                   REFUSED   9 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)

QPID160   Would you call yourself a strong Democrat or a not very strong
           Democrat?
                   STRONG   1 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)
                   NOT VERY STRONG   2 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)
                   DON'T KNOW   8 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)
                   REFUSED   9 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)

QPID170   Do you think of yourself as closer to the Democratic Party or to the
           Republican Party?
                   CLOSER TO DEMOCRATIC   1
                   NEITHER (VOLUNTEERED)   2
                   CLOSER TO REPUBLICAN   3
                   DON'T KNOW   8
                   REFUSED   9

[*SECTION 2-3, ABORTION*]

S2-3-05   SPLIT SAMPLE: TWO-THIRDS GO TO Q2-3-08, ONE-THIRD GO TO
           Q2-3-90.
           RESPONSE OPTION ORDER: FOR HALF THE RESPONDENTS
           WHO GO TO Q2-3-08, PRESENT THE RESPONSE OPTIONS TO
           EACH OF THE ITEMS Q2-3-15, -25, -35, -45, -55, -65, -75 IN THE
           ORDER SHOWN HERE (1,2,3); FOR THE OTHER HALF OF Rs,
           PRESENT EACH RESPONSE OPTION IN REVERSE ORDER (3,2,1).
           QUESTION ORDER RANDOMIZATION: RANDOMIZE THE ORDER
           OF THE APPEARANCE OF Q2-3-10, -20, -30, -40, -50, -60, -70 AND
           RECORD THE ORDER PRESENTED. THUS, THE GO TO
           INSTRUCTIONS FOR THESE ITEMS REPRESENT ONLY ONE
           POSSIBLE ORDERING.
           QUESTION SELECTION RANDOMIZATION: FOR THE TWO-
           THIRDS OF RESPONDENTS SELECTED TO GO TO Q2-3-08 WHEN
           THE SAMPLE IS SPLIT BETWEEN Q2-3-08 AND Q2-30-90, ASK
           EACH OF THE ITEMS Q2-3-10, -20, -30, -40, -50, -60, AND –70 WITH
           A PROBABILITY OF .5. THAT IS, RANDOMLY ASSIGN HALF OF
           THESE Rs TO SKIP Q2-3-10 AND HALF TO ANSWER IT;
           INDEPENDENTLY RANDOMLY ASSIGN HALF TO SKIP Q2-3-20

AND HALF TO ANSWER IT; INDEPENDENTLY RANDOMLY
ASSIGN HALF TO SKIP Q2-3-30 AND HALF TO ANSWER IT; ETC.
FOR FIRST/NEXT FILLS, FILL "First" FOR THE FIRST FILL IN
APPEARING IN THIS SERIES AND FILL "Next" FOR LATER FILLS.

Q2-3-08   Next, I'd like to describe a series of circumstances in which a woman
           might have an abortion. For each one, please tell me whether you favor,
           oppose, or neither favor nor oppose it being <u>legal</u> for the woman to have
           an abortion in that circumstance.

Q2-3-10   (First/Next), do you favor, oppose, or neither favor nor oppose abortion
           being <u>legal</u> if staying pregnant would hurt the woman's health but is very
           unlikely to cause her to die?

           FAVOR   1 (GO TO Q2-3-11)
           OPPOSE   2 (GO TO Q2-3-12)
           NEITHER   3 (GO TO Q2-3-13)
           DON'T KNOW   8 (GO TO Q2-3-13)
           REFUSED   9 (GO TO Q2-3-20)

Q2-3-11   Do you favor that strongly or not strongly?
           STRONGLY   1 (GO TO Q2-3-15)
           NOT STRONGLY   2 (GO TO Q2-3-15)
           DON'T KNOW   8 (GO TO Q2-3-15)
           REFUSED   9 (GO TO Q2-3-15)

Q2-3-12   Do you oppose that strongly or not strongly?
           STRONGLY   1 (GO TO Q2-3-20)
           NOT STRONGLY   2 (GO TO Q2-3-20)
           DON'T KNOW   8 (GO TO Q2-3-20)
           REFUSED   9 (GO TO Q2-3-20)

Q2-3-13   Do you lean toward favoring it, lean toward opposing it, or do you not
           lean either way?
           LEAN TOWARD FAVORING   1 (GO TO Q2-3-15)
           LEAN TOWARD OPPOSING   2 (GO TO Q2-3-20)
           DO NOT LEAN   3 (GO TO Q2-3-20)
           DON'T KNOW   8 (GO TO Q2-3-20)
           REFUSED   9 (GO TO Q2-3-20)

Q2-3-15   Do you think it should be legal for a pregnant woman to have an abortion
           for that reason only during the first three months of pregnancy, before the
           fetus's major organs have fully formed; only during the first six months of
           the pregnancy, before most fetuses can survive outside the mother; or at
           any time during the pregnancy?
           ONLY DURING THE FIRST THREE MONTHS   1
           ONLY DURING THE FIRST SIX MONTHS   2

AT ANY TIME DURING PREGNANCY	3
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q2-3-20 (First/Next), do you favor, oppose, or neither favor nor oppose abortion being <u>legal</u> if staying pregnant could cause the woman to die?

FAVOR	1 (GO TO Q2-3-21)
OPPOSE	2 (GO TO Q2-3-22)
NEITHER	3 (GO TO Q2-3-23)
DON'T KNOW	8 (GO TO Q2-3-23)
REFUSED	9 (GO TO Q2-3-30)

Q2-3-21 Do you favor that strongly or not strongly?

STRONGLY	1 (GO TO Q2-3-25)
NOT STRONGLY	2 (GO TO Q2-3-25)
DON'T KNOW	8 (GO TO Q2-3-25)
REFUSED	9 (GO TO Q2-3-25)

Q2-3-22 Do you oppose that strongly or not strongly?

STRONGLY	1 (GO TO Q2-3-30)
NOT STRONGLY	2 (GO TO Q2-3-30)
DON'T KNOW	8 (GO TO Q2-3-30)
REFUSED	9 (GO TO Q2-3-30)

Q2-3-23 Do you lean toward favoring it, lean toward opposing it, or do you not lean either way?

LEAN TOWARD FAVORING	1 (GO TO Q2-3-25)
LEAN TOWARD OPPOSING	2 (GO TO Q2-3-30)
DO NOT LEAN	3 (GO TO Q2-3-30)
DON'T KNOW	8 (GO TO Q2-3-30)
REFUSED	9 (GO TO Q2-3-30)

Q2-3-25 Do you think it should be legal for a pregnant woman to have an abortion for that reason only during the first three months of pregnancy, before the fetus's major organs have fully formed; only during the first six months of the pregnancy, before most fetuses can survive outside the mother; or at any time during the pregnancy?

ONLY DURING THE FIRST THREE MONTHS	1
ONLY DURING THE FIRST SIX MONTHS	2
AT ANY TIME DURING PREGNANCY	3
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q2-3-30 (First/Next), do you favor, oppose, or neither favor nor oppose abortion being <u>legal</u> if the pregnancy was caused by sex the woman chose to have with a blood relative?

	FAVOR	1 (GO TO Q2-3-31)
	OPPOSE	2 (GO TO Q2-3-32)
	NEITHER	3 (GO TO Q2-3-33)
	DON'T KNOW	8 (GO TO Q2-3-33)
	REFUSED	9 (GO TO Q2-3-40)

Q2-3-31   Do you favor that strongly or not strongly?
                    STRONGLY   1 (GO TO Q2-3-35)
                    NOT STRONGLY   2 (GO TO Q2-3-35)
                    DON'T KNOW   8 (GO TO Q2-3-35)
                    REFUSED   9 (GO TO Q2-3-35)

Q2-3-32   Do you oppose that strongly or not strongly?
                    STRONGLY   1 (GO TO Q2-3-40)
                    NOT STRONGLY   2 (GO TO Q2-3-40)
                    DON'T KNOW   8 (GO TO Q2-3-40)
                    REFUSED   9 (GO TO Q2-3-40)

Q2-3-33   Do you lean toward favoring it, lean toward opposing it, or do you not
           lean either way?
                    LEAN TOWARD FAVORING   1 (GO TO Q2-3-35)
                    LEAN TOWARD OPPOSING   2 (GO TO Q2-3-40)
                    DO NOT LEAN   3 (GO TO Q2-3-40)
                    DON'T KNOW   8 (GO TO Q2-3-40)
                    REFUSED   9 (GO TO Q2-3-40)

Q2-3-35   Do you think it should be legal for a pregnant woman to have an abortion
           for that reason only during the first three months of pregnancy, before the
           fetus's major organs have fully formed; only during the first six months of
           the pregnancy, before most fetuses can survive outside the mother; or at
           any time during the pregnancy?
                    ONLY DURING THE FIRST THREE MONTHS   1
                    ONLY DURING THE FIRST SIX MONTHS   2
                    AT ANY TIME DURING PREGNANCY   3
                    DON'T KNOW   8
                    REFUSED   9

Q2-3-40   (First/Next), do you favor, oppose, or neither favor nor oppose abortion
           being legal if the pregnancy was caused by the woman being raped?
                    FAVOR   1 (GO TO Q2-3-41)
                    OPPOSE   2 (GO TO Q2-3-42)
                    NEITHER   3 (GO TO Q2-3-43)
                    DON'T KNOW   8 (GO TO Q2-3-43)
                    REFUSED   9 (GO TO Q2-3-50)

Q2-3-41   Do you favor that strongly or not strongly?

STRONGLY   1 (GO TO Q2-3-45)
NOT STRONGLY   2 (GO TO Q2-3-45)
DON'T KNOW   8 (GO TO Q2-3-45)
REFUSED   9 (GO TO Q2-3-45)

Q2-3-42   Do you oppose that strongly or not strongly?
                        STRONGLY   1 (GO TO Q2-3-50)
                        NOT STRONGLY 2 (GO TO Q2-3-50)
                        DON'T KNOW   8 (GO TO Q2-3-50)
                        REFUSED   9 (GO TO Q2-3-50)

Q2-3-43   Do you lean toward favoring it, lean toward opposing it, or do you not lean either way?
                        LEAN TOWARD FAVORING   1 (GO TO Q2-3-45)
                        LEAN TOWARD OPPOSING   2 (GO TO Q2-3-50)
                        DO NOT LEAN   3 (GO TO Q2-3-50)
                        DON'T KNOW   8 (GO TO Q2-3-50)
                        REFUSED   9 (GO TO Q2-3-50)

Q2-3-45   Do you think it should be legal for a pregnant woman to have an abortion for that reason only during the first three months of pregnancy, before the fetus's major organs have fully formed; only during the first six months of the pregnancy, before most fetuses can survive outside the mother; or at any time during the pregnancy?
                        ONLY DURING THE FIRST THREE MONTHS   1
                        ONLY DURING THE FIRST SIX MONTHS   2
                        AT ANY TIME DURING PREGNANCY   3
                        DON'T KNOW   8
                        REFUSED   9

Q2-3-50   (First/Next), do you favor, oppose, or neither favor nor oppose abortion being <u>legal</u> if the fetus will be born with a serious birth defect?
                        FAVOR   1 (GO TO Q2-3-51)
                        OPPOSE   2 (GO TO Q2-3-52)
                        NEITHER   3 (GO TO Q2-3-53)
                        DON'T KNOW   8 (GO TO Q2-3-53)
                        REFUSED   9 (GO TO Q2-3-60)

Q2-3-51   Do you favor that strongly or not strongly?
                        STRONGLY   1 (GO TO Q2-3-55)
                        NOT STRONGLY 2 (GO TO Q2-3-55)
                        DON'T KNOW   8 (GO TO Q2-3-55)
                        REFUSED   9 (GO TO Q2-3-55)

Q2-3-52   Do you oppose that strongly or not strongly?
                        STRONGLY   1 (GO TO Q2-3-60)

NOT STRONGLY   2 (GO TO Q2-3-60)
DON'T KNOW   8 (GO TO Q2-3-60)
REFUSED   9 (GO TO Q2-3-60)

Q2-3-53   Do you lean toward favoring it, lean toward opposing it, or do you not lean either way?

LEAN TOWARD FAVORING	1	(GO TO Q2-3-55)
LEAN TOWARD OPPOSING	2	(GO TO Q2-3-60)
DO NOT LEAN	3	(GO TO Q2-3-60)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO Q2-3-60)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO Q2-3-60)

Q2-3-55   Do you think it should be legal for a pregnant woman to have an abortion for that reason only during the first three months of pregnancy, before the fetus's major organs have fully formed; only during the first six months of the pregnancy, before most fetuses can survive outside the mother; or at any time during the pregnancy?

ONLY DURING THE FIRST THREE MONTHS	1
ONLY DURING THE FIRST SIX MONTHS	2
AT ANY TIME DURING PREGNANCY	3
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q2-3-60   (First/Next), do you favor, oppose, or neither favor nor oppose abortion being <u>legal</u> if the child will not be the sex the woman wants it to be?

FAVOR	1	(GO TO Q2-3-61)
OPPOSE	2	(GO TO Q2-3-62)
NEITHER	3	(GO TO Q2-3-63)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO Q2-3-63)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO Q2-3-70)

Q2-3-61   Do you favor that strongly or not strongly?

STRONGLY	1	(GO TO Q2-3-65)
NOT STRONGLY	2	(GO TO Q2-3-65)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO Q2-3-65)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO Q2-3-65)

Q2-3-62   Do you oppose that strongly or not strongly?

STRONGLY	1	(GO TO Q2-3-70)
NOT STRONGLY	2	(GO TO Q2-3-70)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO Q2-3-70)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO Q2-3-70)

Q2-3-63   Do you lean toward favoring it, lean toward opposing it, or do you not lean either way?

LEAN TOWARD FAVORING	1	(GO TO Q2-3-65)

LEAN TOWARD OPPOSING	2 (GO TO Q2-3-70)
DO NOT LEAN	3 (GO TO Q2-3-70)
DON'T KNOW	8 (GO TO Q2-3-70)
REFUSED	9 (GO TO Q2-3-70)

Q2-3-65   Do you think it should be legal for a pregnant woman to have an abortion for that reason only during the first three months of pregnancy, before the fetus's major organs have fully formed; only during the first six months of the pregnancy, before most fetuses can survive outside the mother; or at any time during the pregnancy?

ONLY DURING THE FIRST THREE MONTHS	1
ONLY DURING THE FIRST SIX MONTHS	2
AT ANY TIME DURING PREGNANCY	3
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q2-3-70   (First/Next), do you favor, oppose, or neither favor nor oppose abortion being <u>legal</u> if having the child would be extremely difficult for the woman financially?

FAVOR	1 (GO TO Q2-3-71)
OPPOSE	2 (GO TO Q2-3-72)
NEITHER	3 (GO TO Q2-3-73)
DON'T KNOW	8 (GO TO Q2-3-73)
REFUSED	9 (GO TO S2-3-80)

Q2-3-71   Do you favor that strongly or not strongly?

STRONGLY	1 (GO TO Q2-3-75)
NOT STRONGLY	2 (GO TO Q2-3-75)
DON'T KNOW	8 (GO TO Q2-3-75)
REFUSED	9 (GO TO Q2-3-75)

Q2-3-72   Do you oppose that strongly or not strongly?

STRONGLY	1 (GO TO Q2-3-80)
NOT STRONGLY	2 (GO TO Q2-3-80)
DON'T KNOW	8 (GO TO Q2-3-80)
REFUSED	9 (GO TO Q2-3-80)

Q2-3-73   Do you lean toward favoring it, lean toward opposing it, or do you not lean either way?

LEAN TOWARD FAVORING	1 (GO TO Q2-3-75)
LEAN TOWARD OPPOSING	2 (GO TO S2-3-80)
DO NOT LEAN	3 (GO TO S2-3-80)
DON'T KNOW	8 (GO TO S2-3-80)
REFUSED	9 (GO TO S2-3-80)

Q2-3-75   Do you think it should be legal for a pregnant woman to have an abortion for that reason only during the first three months of pregnancy, before the fetus's major organs have fully formed; only during the first six months of the pregnancy, before most fetuses can survive outside the mother; or at any time during the pregnancy?

ONLY DURING THE FIRST THREE MONTHS	1
ONLY DURING THE FIRST SIX MONTHS	2
AT ANY TIME DURING PREGNANCY	3
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

S2-3-80   GO TO NEXT SECTION.

Q2-3-90   There has been some discussion about abortion during recent years. I am going to read you a short list of opinions. Please tell me which one of the opinions best agrees with your view? You can just tell me the number of the opinion you choose.
One. By law, abortion should never be permitted.
Two. The law should permit abortion only in cases of rape, incest, or when the woman's life is in danger.
Three. The law should permit abortion for reasons other than rape, incest, or danger to the woman's life, but only after the need for the abortion has been clearly established.
Four. By law, a woman should always be able to obtain an abortion as a matter of personal choice.

ABORTION SHOULD NEVER BE PERMITTED	1
ABORTION SHOULD BE PERMITTED IN CASES OF RAPE, INCEST, OR IF WOMAN'S LIFE IS IN DANGER	2
ABORTION SHOULD BE PERMITTED IF NEED IS CLEARLY ESTABLISHED	3
ABORTION IS ALWAYS A PERSONAL CHOICE	4
OTHER, SPECIFY _____	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

[SECTION TOL, TOLERANCE]

STOL05   SPLIT: HALF GO TO QTOL10 AND HALF GO TO QTOL20.

QTOL10   This next question is about a man who admits he is in favor of terrorism against the United States by Muslims. Suppose he wrote a book criticizing the United States that is in your public library. Somebody in your community suggests the book should be removed from the library. Would you favor removing the book or oppose removing the book?

FAVOR REMOVING BOOK	1 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)
OPPOSE REMOVING BOOK	2 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)

DON'T KNOW	8 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)
REFUSED	9 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)

QTOL20   This next question is about a man who admits he is in favor of terrorism against the United States. Suppose he wrote a book criticizing the United States that is in your public library. Somebody in your community suggests the book should be removed from the library. Would you favor removing the book or oppose removing the book?

FAVOR REMOVING BOOK	1 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)
OPPOSE REMOVING BOOK	2 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)
DON'T KNOW	8 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)
REFUSED	9 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)

[SECTION 2-12, JUSTICE]

S2-12-05   SPLIT: HALF GO TO Q2-12-10 AND HALF GO TO Q2-12-60.

Q2-12-10   Next, I'd like to ask you about what happens when members of four groups of people are suspected of committing a crime in America: the first group is all people suspected of committing a crime. The other groups are poor people, white people, and black people.

First, what percent of <u>all</u> the people who are suspected of committing a crime in America do you think are treated fairly by the police?

PROBE FOR A PERCENT FROM 0 TO 100.

NUMBER _ _ _	
DON'T KNOW	888
REFUSED	999

Q2-12-20   What percent of the <u>poor</u> people who are suspected of committing a crime in America do you think are treated fairly by the police?

NUMBER _ _ _	
DON'T KNOW	888
REFUSED	999

Q2-12-30   What percent of the <u>white</u> people who are suspected of committing a crime in America do you think are treated fairly by the police?

NUMBER _ _ _	
DON'T KNOW	888
REFUSED	999

Q2-12-40   What percent of the <u>black</u> people who are suspected of committing a crime in America do you think are treated fairly by the police?

NUMBER _ _ _

	DON'T KNOW	888
	REFUSED	999

S2-12-50   GO TO NEXT SECTION.

Q2-12-60   Next, I'd like to ask you about what happens when members of four groups of people are suspected of committing a crime in America: the first group is black people suspected of committing a crime. The other groups are white people, poor people, and all people.

First, what percent of the <u>black</u> people who are suspected of committing a crime in America do you think are treated fairly by the police?

PROBE FOR A PERCENT FROM 0 TO 100.
NUMBER _ _ _	
DON'T KNOW	888
REFUSED	999

Q2-12-70   What percent of the <u>white</u> people who are suspected of committing a crime in America do you think are treated fairly by the police?
NUMBER _ _ _	
DON'T KNOW	888
REFUSED	999

Q2-12-80   What percent of the <u>poor</u> people who are suspected of committing a crime in America do you think are treated fairly by the police?
NUMBER _ _ _	
DON'T KNOW	888
REFUSED	999

Q2-12-90   What percent of <u>all</u> the people who are suspected of committing a crime in America do you think are treated fairly by the police?
NUMBER _ _ _	
DON'T KNOW	888
REFUSED	999

[SECTION 3-1, GENDER]

S3-1-01   SPLIT: HALF GO TO Q3-1-02 AND HALF GO TO Q3-1-04.

Q3-1-02   Imagine that two people are running against one another for President of the United States in 2008. And imagine that you agree more with one person about what the federal government should and should not do, and you also think that person's background and experience better prepare someone to be President. If it turned out that that person was a woman, would that reduce your chances of voting for her at all, would it increase

your chances of voting for her at all, or would it have no effect on whether you'd vote for her?

REDUCE CHANCES	1	(GO TO Q3-1-03)
INCREASE CHANCES	2	(GO TO Q3-1-03)
NO EFFECT	3	(GO TO Q3-1-06)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO Q3-1-06)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO Q3-1-06)

Q3-1-03   Would it (increase/reduce) your chances of voting for her a great deal, a moderate amount, or a little?

A GREAT DEAL	1	(GO TO Q3-1-06)
A MODERATE AMOUNT	2	(GO TO Q3-1-06)
A LITTLE	3	(GO TO Q3-1-06)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO Q3-1-06)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO Q3-1-06)

Q3-1-04   Imagine that a man and a woman are running against one another for President of the United States in 2008. And imagine that you agree more with the woman than with the man about what the federal government should and should not do. And imagine that you think the woman's background and experience make her a better candidate for President than the man. Would the fact that she is a woman reduce your chances of voting for her at all, would it increase your chances of voting for her at all, or would it have no effect on whether you'd vote for her?

REDUCE CHANCES	1	(GO TO Q3-1-05)
INCREASE CHANCES	2	(GO TO Q3-1-05)
NO EFFECT	3	(GO TO Q3-1-06)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO Q3-1-06)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO Q3-1-06)

Q3-1-05   Would it (increase/reduce) your chances of voting for her a great deal, a moderate amount, or a little?

A GREAT DEAL	1
A MODERATE AMOUNT	2
A LITTLE	3
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q3-1-06   In your opinion, in the best government the U.S. could have, what percent of elected officials would be men?

PERCENT GIVEN	1
	MEN _ _ _
(VOL.) IT MAKES NO DIFFERENCE	2
DON'T KNOW	888
REFUSED	999

Q3-1-07   Do you think that most men candidates who run for political office are
            better suited emotionally to work in government than are most women
            candidates, that most women candidates are better suited emotionally to
            work in government than are most men candidates, or do you think men
            and women candidates are equally suited emotionally to work in
            government?

            MEN   1 (GO TO Q3-1-08)
            WOMEN   2 (GO TO Q3-1-08)
            EQUAL   3 (GO TO Q3-1-10A)
            DON'T KNOW   8 (GO TO Q3-1-10A)
            REFUSED   9 (GO TO Q3-1-10A)

Q3-1-08   A great deal better suited, moderately better suited, or slightly better
            suited?

            A GREAT DEAL BETTER   1 (GO TO Q3-1-10A)
            MODERATELY BETTER   2 (GO TO Q3-1-10A)
            SLIGHTLY BETTER   3 (GO TO Q3-1-10A)
            DON'T KNOW   8 (GO TO Q3-1-10A)
            REFUSED   9 (GO TO Q3-1-10A)

[CATI NOTE: HALF OF RESPONDENTS SHOULD BE ASKED ABOUT
DEMOCRATS AND THEN REPUBLICANS, AS PRESENTED HERE. HALF
SHOULD BE ASKED ABOUT REPUBLICANS AND THEN DEMOCRATS. ALSO,
RANDOMIZE AND DOCUMENT ORDER IN WHICH ISSUES OF CRIME AND
EDUCATION ARE PRESENTED ITEMS Q3-1-10, -30, -50, AND –70.]

Q3-1-10A   Now I have some questions about how men and women who are
            Democrats and Republicans are likely to handle issues in the U.S.
            Congress.

Q3-1-10   Who would do a better job in the U.S. Congress handling
            (crime/education) - a Democrat who is a man, a Democrat who is a
            woman, or would they do an equally good or bad job?

            MAN   1 (GO TO Q3-1-15)
            WOMAN   2 (GO TO Q3-1-15)
            EQUAL   3 (GO TO Q3-1-30)
            DON'T KNOW   8 (GO TO Q3-1-30)
            REFUSED   9 (GO TO Q3-1-30)

Q3-1-15   A great deal better, moderately better, or slightly better?

            A GREAT DEAL BETTER   1
            MODERATELY BETTER   2
            SLIGHTLY BETTER   3
            DON'T KNOW   8
            REFUSED   9

111

Q3-1-30   Who would do a better job in the U.S. Congress handling (education/crime) - a Democrat who is a man, a Democrat who is a woman, or would they do an equally good or bad job?

MAN	1	(GO TO Q3-1-35)
WOMAN	2	(GO TO Q3-1-35)
EQUAL	3	(GO TO Q3-1-50)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO Q3-1-50)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO Q3-1-50)

Q3-1-35   A great deal better, moderately better, or slightly better?

A GREAT DEAL BETTER	1
MODERATELY BETTER	2
SLIGHTLY BETTER	3
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q3-1-50   Who would do a better job in the U.S. Congress handling (crime/education) - a Republican who is a man, a Republican who is a woman, or would they do an equally good or bad job?

MAN	1	(GO TO Q3-1-55)
WOMAN	2	(GO TO Q3-1-55)
EQUAL	3	(GO TO Q3-1-70)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO Q3-1-70)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO Q3-1-70)

Q3-1-55   A great deal better, moderately better, or slightly better?

A GREAT DEAL BETTER	1
MODERATELY BETTER	2
SLIGHTLY BETTER	3
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q3-1-70   Who would do a better job in the U.S. Congress handling (education/crime) - a Republican who is a man, a Republican who is a woman, or would they do an equally good or bad job?

MAN	1	(GO TO Q3-1-75)
WOMAN	2	(GO TO Q3-1-75)
EQUAL	3	(GO TO Q3-1-130)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO Q3-1-130)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO Q3-1-130)

Q3-1-75   A great deal better, moderately better, or slightly better?

A GREAT DEAL BETTER	1
MODERATELY BETTER	2
SLIGHTLY BETTER	3

| | DON'T KNOW | 8 |
| | REFUSED | 9 |

Q3-1-130   Which Congressional Representative do you think would be more likely to support abortion being legal in all circumstances – a Democrat who is a man, a Democrat who is a woman, or would they be equally likely?

MAN	1 (GO TO Q3-1-135)
WOMAN	2 (GO TO Q3-1-135)
EQUAL	3 (GO TO Q3-1-150)
DON'T KNOW	8 (GO TO Q3-1-150)
REFUSED	9 (GO TO Q3-1-150)

Q3-1-135   A great deal more likely, moderately more likely, or slightly more likely?

A GREAT DEAL MORE LIKELY	1
MODERATELY MORE LIKELY	2
SLIGHTLY MORE LIKELY	3
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q3-1-150   Which Congressional Representative do you think would be more likely to support abortion being legal in all circumstances – a Republican who is a man, a Republican who is a woman, or would they be equally likely?

MAN	1 (GO TO Q3-1-155)
WOMAN	2 (GO TO Q3-1-155)
EQUAL	3 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)
DON'T KNOW	8 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)
REFUSED	9 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)

Q3-1-155   A great deal more likely, moderately more likely, or slightly more likely?

A GREAT DEAL MORE LIKELY	1
MODERATELY MORE LIKELY	2
SLIGHTLY MORE LIKELY	3
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

[SECTION 4-11: TAX]

Q4-11-10   This next question is about the percent of people's income that they should pay in taxes to the federal government. Which one of the following opinions best agrees with your view? You can just tell me the number of the opinion you choose. One: People who make more money should pay a larger percent of their income in taxes to the government than people who make less money. Two: people who make more money should pay a smaller percent of their income in taxes to the government than people

who make less money. Three: the amount of money people make should not determine what percent of their income they pay in taxes.

LARGER PERCENT	1
SMALLER PERCENT	2
INCOME SHOULD NOT DETERMINE TAX RATE	3
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q4-11-20   Do you think that big companies should pay a <u>larger</u> percent of their profits in taxes than small businesses do, that big companies should pay a <u>smaller</u> percent of their profits in taxes than small businesses do, or that big companies and small businesses should pay the <u>same</u> percent of their profits in taxes?

LARGER	1
SMALLER	2
THE SAME	3
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

S4-11-30   SPLIT SAMPLE: HALF GO TO Q4-11-40 AND HALF GO TO Q4-11-60

Q4-11-40   When a person dies and leaves money to someone else, do you think the federal government should require that some of this money be paid in taxes, or that the federal government should not do this?

SHOULD	1 (GO TO Q4-11-50)
SHOULD NOT	2 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)
DON'T KNOW	8 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)
REFUSED	9 (GO TO NEXT SECTION)

Q4-11-50   Do you think that a bigger percent of the money should be paid in taxes when the person who died left more money, that a smaller percent should be paid in taxes when the person who died left more money, or that the same percent should be paid in taxes no matter how much the person left?

LARGER PERCENT	1
SMALLER PERCENT	2
THE SAME PERCENT	3
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

S4-11-55   GO TO NEXT SECTION.

Q4-11-60   There has been a lot of talk recently about doing away with the tax on large inheritances, the so-called estate tax. Do you favor or oppose doing away with the estate tax?

FAVOR DOING AWAY WITH TAX	1

OPPOSE DOING AWAY WITH TAX   2
DON'T KNOW   8
REFUSED   9

[SECTION 3-9: PARTISAN DIFFERENCES]

S3-9-10   SPLIT: HALF GO TO Q3-9-10 AND HALF GO TO Q3-9-60.

Q3-9-10   How similar would you say that U.S. citizens who think of themselves as Democrats are to each other? Extremely similar, very similar, moderately similar, slightly similar, or not similar at all?
    EXTEMELY SIMILAR   1
    VERY SIMILAR   2
    MODERATELY SIMILAR 3
    SLIGHTLY SIMILAR   4
    NOT SIMILAR AT ALL   5
    DON'T KNOW   8
    REFUSED   9

Q3-9-20   Among U.S. citizens who think of themselves as Democrats, how much disagreement do you think there is about how this country should be run? A great deal, a lot, a moderate amount, a little, or none?
    A GREAT DEAL   1
    A LOT   2
    A MODERATE AMOUNT 3
    A LITTLE   4
    NONE   5
    DON'T KNOW   8
    REFUSED   9

Q3-9-30   How similar would you say that U.S. citizens who think of themselves as Republicans are to each other? Extremely similar, very similar, moderately similar, slightly similar, or not similar at all?
    EXTREMELEY SIMILAR 1
    VERY SIMILAR   2
    MODERATELY SIMILAR 3
    SLIGHTLY SIMILAR   4
    NOT SIMILAR AT ALL   5
    DON'T KNOW   8
    REFUSED   9

Q3-9-40   Among U.S. citizens who think of themselves as Republicans, how much disagreement do you think there is about how this country should be run? A great deal, a lot, a moderate amount, a little, or none?
    A GREAT DEAL   1
    A LOT   2

A MODERATE AMOUNT	3
A LITTLE	4
NONE	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

S3-9-50   GO TO NEXT SECTION.

Q3-9-60   How similar would you say that U.S. citizens who think of themselves as Republicans are to each other? Extremely similar, very similar, moderately similar, slightly similar, or not similar at all?

EXTREMELEY SIMILAR	1
VERY SIMILAR	2
MODERATELY SIMILAR	3
SLIGHTLY SIMILAR	4
NOT SIMILAR AT ALL	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q3-9-70   Among U.S. citizens who think of themselves as Republicans, how much disagreement do you think there is about how this country should be run? A great deal, a lot, a moderate amount, a little, or none?

A GREAT DEAL	1
A LOT	2
A MODERATE AMOUNT	3
A LITTLE	4
NONE	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q3-9-80   How similar would you say that U.S. citizens who think of themselves as Democrats are to each other? Extremely similar, very similar, moderately similar, slightly similar, or not similar at all?

EXTREMELEY SIMILAR	1
VERY SIMILAR	2
MODERATELY SIMILAR	3
SLIGHTLY SIMILAR	4
NOT SIMILAR AT ALL	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q3-9-90   Among U.S. citizens who think of themselves as Democrats, how much disagreement do you think there is about how this country should be run? A great deal, a lot, a moderate amount, a little, or none?

A GREAT DEAL	1

```
A LOT                      2
A MODERATE AMOUNT  3
A LITTLE                   4
NONE                       5
DON'T KNOW                 8
REFUSED                    9
```

[SECTION VOTE: VOTING]

SVOTE2   SPLIT: HALF GO TO QVOTE5 AND HALF GO TO QVOTE7.

QVOTE5   Suppose that an election were being held today that would determine who
            the President of the United States is for the next four years. And imagine
            that the only candidates allowed to run in that election were Bill Clinton
            and George W. Bush. And imagine that you voted in that election. Who
            would you vote for: Bill Clinton or George W. Bush?

```
            CLINTON                         1
            BUSH                            3
            NEITHER/OTHER (VOLUNTEERED)     5
            DON'T KNOW                      8
            REFUSED                         9
```

SVOTE6   GO TO SVOTE10.

QVOTE7   Suppose that an election were being held today that would determine who
            the President of the United States is for the next four years. And imagine
            that the only candidates allowed to run in that election were George W.
            Bush and Bill Clinton. And imagine that you voted in that election. Who
            would you vote for: George W. Bush or Bill Clinton?

```
            BUSH                            2
            CLINTON                         4
            NEITHER/OTHER (VOLUNTEERED)     5
            DON'T KNOW                      8
            REFUSED                         9
```

SVOTE10   SPLIT: HALF GO TO QVOTE20, HALF GO TO QVOTE30.

QVOTE20   In talking to people about elections, we often find that a lot of people were
            not able to vote because they weren't registered, they were sick, or they
            just didn't have time. How about you--did you vote in the elections this
            November?

```
            YES              1 (GO TO QVOTE25)
            NO               2 (GO TO SVOTE70)
            DON'T KNOW       8 (GO TO SVOTE70)
            REFUSED          9 (GO TO SVOTE70)
```

[FILL INSTRUCTION FOR QVOTE25: FILL AS "vote by mail" IN OREGON, AND FILL AS "mail in an absentee ballot before election day" EVERYWHERE ELSE.]

QVOTE25   Did you vote in person on election day, or did you (vote by mail / mail in an absentee ballot before election day)?

VOTED IN PERSON	1	(GO TO SVOTE190)
VOTED BY MAIL	2	(GO TO SVOTE190)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO SVOTE70)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO SVOTE70)

[CATI program note for filling number of days/weeks/months in QVOTE30: Compute number of days elapsed since election. If fewer than 14 days have elapsed fill the number of days, e.g. "1 day" or "12 days". If 14 through 28 days have passed, compute elapsed days and weeks and fill this information, e.g. "two weeks" or "two weeks and three days" or "four weeks". If 29 or more days have passed, divide the number by 7, round to the nearest whole number, and report the number of weeks, e.g. "six weeks".]

QVOTE30   The next question is about the election that was held on November 7, (NUMBER days/weeks) ago. In talking to people about elections, we often find that a lot of people were not able to vote because they weren't registered, they were sick, they didn't have time, or something else happened to prevent them from voting. And sometimes, people who usually vote or who planned to vote forget that something unusual happened on election day this year that prevented them from voting this time. So please think carefully for a minute about the election held on November 7, [PAUSE] and past elections in which you may have voted and answer the following questions about your voting behavior.

During the past 6 years, did you usually vote in national, state, and local elections, or did you usually NOT vote?

USUALLY VOTE	1
USUALLY NOT VOTE	2
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

QVOTE40   During the months leading up to the election held on November 7, did you ever plan to vote in that election, or didn't you plan to do that?

DID PLAN TO VOTE	1
DID NOT PLAN TO VOTE	2
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

QVOTE50   In the election held on November 7, did you definitely vote in person on election day, definitely mail in a completed absentee ballot before election day, definitely not vote, or are you not completely sure whether you voted

in that election?

DEFINITELY VOTED IN PERSON	1	(GO TO SVOTE190)
DEFINITELY VOTED BY MAIL	2	(GO TO SVOTE190)
DEFINITELY DID NOT VOTE	3	(GO TO SVOTE70)
NOT COMPLETELY SURE	4	(GO TO QVOTE55)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO QVOTE60)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO SVOTE70)

QVOTE55   What makes you not completely sure about this?
TEXT RESPONSE

_____

_____

QVOTE60   If you had to guess, would you say that you probably did vote in the
election held on November 7, or probably did not vote in that election?

PROBABLY DID VOTE	1	(GO TO SVOTE70)
PROBABLY DID NOT VOTE	2	(GO TO SVOTE70)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO SVOTE70)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO SVOTE70)

SVOTE70   IF R LIVES IN WASHINGTON DC, GO TO NEXT SECTION. ELSE,
GO TO QVOTE80.

QVOTE80   In the election, did you prefer one of the candidates for the U.S. House of
Representatives in your district?

YES	1	(GO TO QVOTE90)
NO	2	(GO TO SVOTE110)
DON'T KNOW	8	(GO TO SVOTE110)
REFUSED	9	(GO TO SVOTE110)

QVOTE90   Which candidate did you prefer?
RECORD NAME. IF R CANNOT RECALL NAME, RECORD
DESCRIPTION.

TEXT RESPONSE _____	
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

QVOTE100   Was (that candidate/"NAME FROM QVOTE90") a Democrat, a
Republican, or something else?

DEMOCRAT	1
REPUBLICAN	2
OTHER	3
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

SVOTE110   IF SENATE ELECTION IN STATE, GO TO QVOTE120. ELSE, GO TO

SVOTE150. [ELECTIONS FOR U.S. SENATE ARE TAKING PLACE IN Ariz., Cal., Conn., Del., Fla., Haw., Ind., Maine, Maryland, Mass., Mich., Minn., Mississippi, Missouri, Mont., Neb., Nev., New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, N. Dak., Ohio, Penn., RI, Tenn., Tex., Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Wash., WV, Wisc., and Wyo.]

QVOTE120   Did you prefer one of the candidates for U.S. Senate in your state?
                YES   1 (GO TO QVOTE130)
                NO   2 (GO TO SVOTE150)
                DON'T KNOW   8 (GO TO QVOTE150)
                REFUSED   9 (GO TO SVOTE150)

QVOTE130   Which candidate did you prefer?
RECORD NAME. IF R CANNOT RECALL NAME, RECORD DESCRIPTION.
                TEXT RESPONSE _____
                DON'T KNOW   8
                REFUSED   9

QVOTE140   Was (that candidate/"NAME FROM QVOTE 130") a Democrat, Republican, or something else?
                DEMOCRAT   1
                REPUBLICAN   2
                OTHER   3
                DON'T KNOW   8
                REFUSED   9

SVOTE150   GO TO NEXT SECTION.

SVOTE190   IF R LIVES IN WASHINGTON DC, GO TO NEXT SECTION. ELSE, GO TO QVOTE200.

QVOTE200   How about the election for the House of Representatives in Washington? Did you vote for a candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives?
                YES   1 (GO TO QVOTE210)
                NO   2 (GO TO SVOTE230)
                DON'T KNOW   8 (GO TO QVOTE230)
                REFUSED   9 (GO TO SVOTE230)

QVOTE210   Who did you vote for?
RECORD NAME. IF R CANNOT RECALL NAME, RECORD DESCRIPTION.
                TEXT RESPONSE _____
                DON'T KNOW   8
                REFUSED   9

QVOTE220   Was (that candidate/"NAME FROM QVOTE210") a Democrat, a
            Republican, or something else?
            DEMOCRAT   1
            REPUBLICAN   2
            OTHER   3
            DON'T KNOW   8
            REFUSED   9

SVOTE230   IF U.S. SENATE ELECTION IN STATE, GO TO QVOTE240. ELSE,
            GO TO SVOTE270. [ELECTIONS FOR U.S. SENATE ARE TAKING
            PLACE IN Ariz., Cal., Conn., Del., Fla., Haw., Ind., Maine, Maryland,
            Mass., Mich., Minn., Mississippi, Missouri, Mont., Neb., Nev., New
            Jersey, New Mexico, New York, N. Dak., Ohio, Penn., RI, Tenn., Tex.,
            Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Wash., WV, Wisc., and Wyo.]

QVOTE240   How about the election for the United States Senate? Did you vote for a
            candidate for the U.S. Senate?
            YES   1 (GO TO QVOTE250)
            NO   2 (GO TO SVOTE270)
            DON'T KNOW   8 (GO TO SVOTE270)
            REFUSED   9 (GO TO SVOTE270)

QVOTE250   Who did you vote for?
            RECORD NAME. IF R CANNOT RECALL NAME, RECORD
            DESCRIPTION.
            TEXT RESPONSE _____
            DON'T KNOW   8
            REFUSED   9

QVOTE260   Was (that candidate/"NAME FROM QVOTE 250") a Democrat,
            Republican, or something else?
            DEMOCRAT   1
            REPUBLICAN   2
            OTHER   3
            DON'T KNOW   8
            REFUSED   9

SVOTE270   GO TO NEXT SECTION.

[SECTION BR: BRANCHING EXPERIMENTS ON BUSH APPROVAL]

SBR05   RANDOMLY ASSIGN HALF OF Rs TO BRGROUP=1 AND HALF TO
            BRGROUP=2. IF BRGROUP=1, R WILL GET "STRONGLY OR NOT
            STRONGLY" FOLLOW-UPS THROUGHOUT THIS SECTION. ELSE
            IF BRGROUP=2, R WILL GET "EXTREMELY STRONGLY,
            MODERATELY STRONGLY, OR SLIGHTLY STRONGLY"

121

FOLLOW-UPS THROUGHOUT THIS SECTION.

QBR10   Do you approve, disapprove, or neither approve nor disapprove of the way George W. Bush is handling his job as president?

APPROVE	1
DISAPPROVE	2
NEITHER APPROVE NOR DISAPPROVE	3
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

SBR20   IF BRGROUP=1 GO TO SBR30, ELSE IF BRGROUP=2 GO TO SBR70

SBR30   IF QBR10=1, GO TO QBR40. IF QBR10=2, GO TO QBR50. IF QBR10=3 OR 8, GO TO QBR60. IF QBR10=9 GO TO SBR110.

QBR40   Do you approve strongly or not strongly?

STRONGLY	1
NOT STRONGLY	2
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

SBR45   GO TO SBR110.

QBR50   Do you disapprove strongly or not strongly?

STRONGLY	1
NOT STRONGLY	2
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

SBR55   GO TO SBR110.

QBR60   Do you lean toward approving, lean toward disapproving, or do you not lean either way?

LEAN TOWARD APPROVING	1
LEAN TOWARD DISAPPROVING	2
DO NOT LEAN	3
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

SBR65.   GO TO SBR110.

SBR70   IF QBR10=1, GO TO QBR80. IF QBR10=2, GO TO QBR90. IF QBR10=3 OR 8, GO TO QBR100. IF QBR10=9 GO TO SBR110.

QBR80   Do you approve extremely strongly, moderately strongly, or slightly strongly?

EXTREMELY STRONGLY	1
MODERATELY STRONGLY	2
SLIGHTLY STRONGLY	3
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

SBR85   GO TO SBR110.

QBR90   Do you disapprove extremely strongly, moderately strongly, or slightly strongly?

EXTREMELY STRONGLY	1
MODERATELY STRONGLY	2
SLIGHTLY STRONGLY	3
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

SBR95   GO TO SBR110.

QBR100   Do you lean toward approving, lean toward disapproving, or do you not lean either way?

LEAN TOWARD APPROVING	1
LEAN TOWARD DISAPPROVING	2
DO NOT LEAN	3
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

SBR110   GO TO QBR200.

 [STAFF NOTE: BRANCHING BUSH ON ECONOMY]

QBR200   Do you approve, disapprove, or neither approve nor disapprove of the way George W. Bush is handling the economy?

APPROVE	1
DISAPPROVE	2
NEITHER APPROVE NOR DISAPPROVE	3
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

SBR210   IF BRGROUP=1 GO TO SBR220, ELSE IF BRGROUP=2 GO TO SBR260.

SBR220   IF QBR200=1, GO TO QBR230. IF QBR200=2, GO TO QBR240. IF QBR200=3 OR 8, GO TO QBR250. IF QBR200=9 GO TO QBR300.

QBR230   Do you approve strongly or not strongly?

STRONGLY	1

	NOT STRONGLY	2
	DON'T KNOW	8
	REFUSED	9

SBR235   GO TO QBR300.

QBR240   Do you disapprove strongly or not strongly?

	STRONGLY	1
	NOT STRONGLY	2
	DON'T KNOW	8
	REFUSED	9

SBR245   GO TO QBR300.

QBR250   Do you lean toward approving, lean toward disapproving, or do you not lean either way?

	LEAN TOWARD APPROVING	1
	LEAN TOWARD DISAPPROVING	2
	DO NOT LEAN	3
	DON'T KNOW	8
	REFUSED	9

SBR255   GO TO QBR300.

SBR260   IF QBR200=1, GO TO QBR270. IF QBR200=2, GO TO QBR280. IF QBR200=3 OR 8, GO TO QBR290. IF QBR200=9 GO TO QBR300.

QBR270   Do you approve extremely strongly, moderately strongly, or slightly strongly?

	EXTREMELY STRONGLY	1
	MODERATELY STRONGLY	2
	SLIGHTLY STRONGLY	3
	DON'T KNOW	8
	REFUSED	9

SBR275   GO TO QBR300.

QBR280   Do you disapprove extremely strongly, moderately strongly, or slightly strongly?

	EXTREMELY STRONGLY	1
	MODERATELY STRONGLY	2
	SLIGHTLY STRONGLY	3
	DON'T KNOW	8
	REFUSED	9

SBR285   GO TO QBR300.

QBR290   Do you lean toward approving, lean toward disapproving, or do you not lean either way?

LEAN TOWARD APPROVING	1
LEAN TOWARD DISAPPROVING	2
DO NOT LEAN	3
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

[STAFF NOTE: BRANCHING BUSH HANDLING FOREIGN RELATIONS]

QBR300   Do you approve, disapprove, or neither approve nor disapprove of the way George W. Bush is handling our relations with foreign countries?

APPROVE	1
DISAPPROVE	2
NEITHER APPROVE NOR DISAPPROVE	3
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

SBR310   IF BRGROUP=1 GO TO SBR320, ELSE IF BRGROUP=2 GO TO SBR360

SBR320   IF QBR300=1, GO TO QBR330. IF QBR300=2, GO TO QBR340. IF QBR300=3 OR 8, GO TO QBR350. IF QBR300=9 GO TO QBR400.

QBR330   Do you approve strongly or not strongly?

STRONGLY	1
NOT STRONGLY	2
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

SBR335   GO TO QBR400.

QBR340   Do you disapprove strongly or not strongly?

STRONGLY	1
NOT STRONGLY	2
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

SBR345   GO TO QBR400.

QBR350   Do you lean toward approving, lean toward disapproving, or do you not lean either way?

LEAN TOWARD APPROVING	1
LEAN TOWARD DISAPPROVING	2
DO NOT LEAN	3

| | DON'T KNOW | 8 |
| | REFUSED | 9 |

SBR355   GO TO QBR400.

SBR360   IF QBR300=1, GO TO QBR370. IF QBR300=2, GO TO QBR380. IF QBR300=3 OR 8, GO TO QBR390. IF QBR300=9 GO TO QBR400.

QBR370   Do you approve extremely strongly, moderately strongly, or slightly strongly?

EXTREMELY STRONGLY	1
MODERATELY STRONGLY	2
SLIGHTLY STRONGLY	3
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

SBR375   GO TO QBR400.

QBR380   Do you disapprove extremely strongly, moderately strongly, or slightly strongly?

EXTREMELY STRONGLY	1
MODERATELY STRONGLY	2
SLIGHTLY STRONGLY	3
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

SBR385   GO TO QBR400.

QBR390   Do you lean toward approving, lean toward disapproving, or do you not lean either way?

LEAN TOWARD APPROVING	1
LEAN TOWARD DISAPPROVING	2
DO NOT LEAN	3
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

QBR400   Do you approve, disapprove, or neither approve nor disapprove of the way George W. Bush is handling terrorism?

APPROVE	1
DISAPPROVE	2
NEITHER APPROVE NOR DISAPPROVE	3
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

SBR410   IF BRGROUP=1 GO TO SBR420, ELSE IF BRGROUP=2 GO TO SBR460

SBR420   IF QBR400=1, GO TO QBR430. IF QBR400=2, GO TO QBR440. IF QBR400=3 OR 8, GO TO QBR450. IF QBR400=9 GO TO SBR500.

QBR430   Do you approve strongly or not strongly?

STRONGLY	1
NOT STRONGLY	2
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

SBR435   GO TO SBR500.

QBR440   Do you disapprove strongly or not strongly?

STRONGLY	1
NOT STRONGLY	2
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

SBR445   GO TO SBR500.

QBR450   Do you lean toward approving, lean toward disapproving, or do you not lean either way?

LEAN TOWARD APPROVING	1
LEAN TOWARD DISAPPROVING	2
DO NOT LEAN	3
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

SBR455   GO TO SBR500.

SBR460   IF QBR400=1, GO TO QBR470. IF QBR400=2, GO TO QBR480. IF QBR400=3 OR 8, GO TO QBR490. ELSE, GO TO SBR500.

QBR470   Do you approve extremely strongly, moderately strongly, or slightly strongly?

EXTREMELY STRONGLY	1
MODERATELY STRONGLY	2
SLIGHTLY STRONGLY	3
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

SBR475   GO TO SBR500.

QBR480   Do you disapprove extremely strongly, moderately strongly, or slightly strongly?

EXTREMELY STRONGLY	1

MODERATELY STRONGLY	2
SLIGHTLY STRONGLY	3
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

SBR485   GO TO SBR500.

QBR490   Do you lean toward approving, lean toward disapproving, or do you not lean either way?

LEAN TOWARD APPROVING	1
LEAN TOWARD DISAPPROVING	2
DO NOT LEAN	3
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

SBR500   GO TO NEXT SECTION.

[SECTION ECON: ECONOMY]

QECON30   Now thinking about the economy in the country as a whole, would you say that over the past year, the nation's economy has gotten better, stayed about the same, or gotten worse?

BETTER	1
STAYED ABOUT THE SAME	2
WORSE	3
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

[SECTION DEATH]

QDEATH   On another subject now. When you think about the possibility of your own death, how upsetting is that? Extremely upsetting, very upsetting, moderately upsetting, slightly upsetting, or not upsetting at all?

EXTREMELY UPSETTING	1
VERY UPSETTING	2
MODERATELY UPSETTING	3
SLIGHTLY UPSETTING	4
NOT UPSETTING AT ALL	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

Q2-16-10   How likely do you think it is that a majority of all people on Earth will die all at once sometime during the next 100 years because of a single event? Extremely likely, very likely, moderately likely, slightly likely, or not likely at all?

EXTREMELY LIKELY	1

VERY LIKELY	2
MODERATELY LIKELY	3
SLIGHTLY LIKELY	4
NOT LIKELY AT ALL	5
DON'T KNOW	8
REFUSED	9

END. [THANK RESPONDENT. VERIFY ADDRESS TO MAIL CHECK, AND TELL RESPONDENT IT WILL TAKE ABOUT TWO WEEKS TO RECEIVE CHECK].

END2 THANK INFORMANT AND HANG UP.

[*SECTION IWR: INTERVIEWER RATINGS*]

[CATI INSTRUCTION: RANDOMIZE THE ORDER OF ALL THE ITEMS IN SECTION IWR. THE INTERVEIWER SHOULD ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS ABOUT EACH RESPONDENT AT THE END OF THE INTERVIEW IN CATI, AFTER THE R IS OFF THE PHONE.]

IWR10 How hard did the respondent work to answer the questions accurately? Extremely hard, very hard, moderately hard, slightly hard, or not hard at all?

EXTREMELY HARD	1
VERY HARD	2
MODERATELY HARD	3
SLIGHTLY HARD	4
NOT HARD AT ALL	5

IWR20 How difficult was it for the respondent to understand the questions? Extremely difficult, very difficult, moderately difficult, slightly difficult, or not difficult at all?

EXTREMELY DIFFICULT	1
VERY DIFFICULT	2
MODERATELY DIFFICULT	3
SLIGHTLY DIFFICULT	4
NOT DIFFICULT AT ALL	5

IWR30 How difficult was it for the respondent to come up with answers to the questions? Extremely difficult, very difficult, moderately difficult, slightly difficult, or not difficult at all?

EXTREMELY DIFFICULT	1
VERY DIFFICULT	2

MODERATELY DIFFICULT	3
SLIGHTLY DIFFICULT	4
NOT DIFFICULT AT ALL	5

IWR40   How intelligent would you say the respondent is? Much above average, a little above average, average, a little below average, or much below average?

MUCH ABOVE AVERAGE	1
A LITTLE ABOVE AVERAGE	2
AVERAGE	3
A LITTLE BELOW AVERAGE	4
MUCH BELOW AVERAGE	5

IWR50   How reluctant to begin the interview did the respondent seem? Extremely reluctant, very reluctant, moderately reluctant, slightly reluctant, or not reluctant at all?

EXTREMELY RELUCTANT	1
VERY RELUCTANT	2
MODERATELY RELUCTANT	3
SLIGHTLY RELUCTANT	4
NOT RELUCTANT AT ALL	5

IWR60   How cooperative was the respondent? Extremely cooperative, very cooperative, moderately cooperative, slightly cooperative, or not cooperative at all?

EXTREMELY COOPERATIVE	1
VERY COOPERATIVE	2
MODERATELY COOPERATIVE	3
SLIGHTLY COOPERATIVE	4
NOT COOPERATIVE AT ALL	5

IWR70   When you started speaking to the respondent, how suspicious did (he/she) seem to be about who you are and why you were calling? Extremely suspicious, very suspicious, moderately suspicious, slightly suspicious, or not suspicious at all?

EXTREMELY SUSPICIOUS	1
VERY SUSPICIOUS	2
MODERATELY SUSPICIOUS	3
SLIGHTLY SUSPICIOUS	4
NOT SUSPICOUS AT ALL	5

IWR80   During the interview, how worried did the respondent seem about reporting personal information?

EXTREMELY WORRIED	1
VERY WORRIED	2
MODERATELY WORRIED	3

SLIGHTLY WORRIED	4
NOT WORRIED AT ALL	5

IWR90   How concerned did the respondent seem to be that you might not be who you say you are, or that you are not really doing what you said you are doing? Extremely concerned, very concerned, moderately concerned, slightly concerned, or not concerned at all?

EXTREMELY CONCERNED	1
VERY CONCERNED	2
MODERATELY CONCERNED	3
SLIGHTLY CONCERNED	4
NOT CONCERNED AT ALL	5

IWR100   How interested was the respondent in the interview? Extremely interested, very interested, moderately interested, slightly interested, or not interested at all?

EXTREMELY INTERESTED	1
VERY INTERESTED	2
MODERATELY INTERESTED	3
SLIGHTLY INTERESTED	4
NOT INTERESTED AT ALL	5

IWR110   How much did the respondent enjoy the interview? A great deal, a lot, a moderate amount, a little, or not at all?

A GREAT DEAL	1
A LOT	2
A MODERATE AMOUNT	3
A LITTLE	4
NOT AT ALL	5

IWR120   Please indicate which of the following complaints the respondent made about the interview. CODE ALL THAT APPLY.

Survey is too long.	1
Survey is too complicated	2
Survey is boring, tedious, repetitive.	3
Respondent wanted to stop before interview completed.	4
After starting the interview, respondent said he/she regretted having agreed to be interviewed	5
None	6

MULTI PUNCH _____

Interviewer Background Questionnaire

[These questions can be administered on paper, or by whatever means SRBI finds convenient, just once per interviewer. Please identify interviewers only by number. The ID number must match the ID number of the interviewer that is associated with the respondents that the IWR interviewed, and which is delivered on the survey data file. This should be an ID number generated solely for this project, not an SRBI employee ID, in order to preserve IWR anonymity. SRBI may deliver the interviewer background data to Stanford/Michigan separately, and Stanford/Michigan can merge them with the survey data by interviewer ID, or SRBI may merge these data with the survey data and deliver just one file, at SRBI's discretion.]

We would be grateful for your answers to as many of the questions below as you are willing to provide. Your answers will never be connected to your name.

Are you male or female?
           Male   1
           Female   2

What year were you born?
           19 _ _

Are you Hispanic/Latino, or are you not Hispanic/Latino?
           Hispanic/Latino   1
           Not Hispanic/Latino   2

What is your race? Please enter all that apply.
           White   1
           Black   2
           Asian or Pacific Islander   3
           Native American   4
           Other   5

What is the highest grade of school or year of college that you have completed?
           Grades 0-12, no diploma   1
           High school diploma or equivalent   2
           Some college   3
           Bachelor's degree or higher   4

How many years have you worked as a <u>telephone</u> interviewer doing surveys for any survey company?
           ENTER NUMBER ___

Generally speaking, do you think of yourself as a Democrat, Republican, Independent, or what?

Strong Democrat	1
Not strong Democrat	2
Independent leaning toward Democrat	3
Independent	4
Independent leaning toward Republican	5
Not strong Republican	6
Strong Republican	7
Other	8

How interested are you in information about what's going on in government and politics? Extremely interested, very interested, moderately interested, slightly interested, or not interested at all?

EXTREMELY INTERESTED	1
VERY INTERESTED	2
MODERATELY INTERESTED	3
SLIGHTLY INTERESTED	4
NOT INTERESTED AT ALL	5

Appendix C: Respondent Contact Letters and Fax

This appendix presents the advance letters, refusal conversion letters, and fax letter sent to respondents before and during the field period.

Each letter was sent on letterhead bearing the color logos of the ANES, the University of Michigan, and Stanford University in the margin on the left side.

These materials are as follows:

- Advance letter
- Refusal conversion letter, general
- Refusal conversion letter, too busy
- Refusal conversion letter, not at home
- Refusal conversion letter, partial interview
- Refusal conversion letter, confidentiality concerns
- Refusal conversion letter, not interested in politics
- Refusal conversion letter, do not call
- Last ditch letter, no contact
- Last ditch letter, general
- Fax sent to respondent telephone numbers answered by a fax machine.

<<DATE >>

<<TITLE>><<FIRST>><<LAST>>
<<ADDRESS1>>
<<ADDRESS2>>
<<CITY>><<STATE>><<ZIP>>

Dear <<TITLE>><<LAST>>:

We are writing first to thank you very much for helping us two years ago, when you were kind enough to be interviewed for the 2004 American National Election Study research survey. At that time, you were a part of the nation's most important study of people's thinking at the time of the 2004 presidential election, and we are very grateful to you.

We are hoping that we may speak with you one last time. In the coming weeks, we will be interviewing everyone we talked with in 2004, this time for the 2006 American National Election Study survey.

So that we can accurately understand changes in opinions and experiences of all Americans during the last two years, it's important that we speak with you again. We hope very much that we can count on your help to talk with our interviewer when you get the call.

To thank you for your time being interviewed, we can offer you a gift of <<AMT>> dollars. And to thank you for reading this letter, we have enclosed $2.

When our interviewer calls, if you would like to confirm his or her identity, you may call SRBI (the firm conducting the interviewing) at this toll-free number: <<NUMBER>>.

Your participation would, of course, be voluntary, and you can decline to answer any questions you wish. Your name will never be connected with your answers to our questions at any time, and your answers will be kept completely confidential.

If you would like to speak with us about this study. you may call us personally at <<NUMBER>> (Jon) or <<NUMBER>> (Arthur).

Thanks very much for considering our request.

All the best,

Jon A. Krosnick, Ph.D.
Director, American National Election Studies
Stanford University

Arthur Lupia, Ph.D.
Director, American National Election Studies
University of Michigan

PS – You may also contact the Stanford University Institutional Review Board (IRB) at <<NUMBER>>, or you may write the Stanford IRB, Administrative Panels Office, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305-5401. The interviews will last about 45 minutes on average and will ask about your opinions and experiences in various areas of life. There are no risks associated with participating in this study. After you begin the interview, you may stop at any time and still receive our thank-you gift.

<<DATE >>

<<TITLE>><<FIRST>><<LAST>>
<<ADDRESS1>>
<<ADDRESS2>>
<<CITY>><<STATE>><<ZIP>>

Dear <<TITLE>><<LAST>>:

Thank you very much for talking with the interviewer from SRBI, who called to ask you to be interviewed for the 2006 American National Election Study.

The only people we can interview for this survey are people who we interviewed in 2004, so that means we cannot replace you with anyone else, and we're very hopeful that we might be able to reach you at another time when you might be able to complete the interview.

The interview is easy to do, and most find it interesting and enjoyable. And to thank you for your time doing the interview, we can offer you a gift of <<AMT>> dollars.

You may skip answering any question if you would like to. We will never connect your name with your answers to the questions, and the results will only be reported combining everyone who answers as a group.

We can call you at any time you like to complete the interview. If you would like to spread the interview over a few short conversations during a few days, we can do that, too.

If we can do anything else to make this easy for you, please let us know – we'll do our best to do what you'd prefer.

If you're willing, we would be grateful if you would please call our interviewing firm, SRBI, at this toll-free number to arrange a time to be interviewed: <<NUMBER>>.

If we don't hear from you, we've asked SRBI to call you back one more time to see if we might be able to set up a way that you'd be comfortable doing the interview.

If you would like to speak with us about this study, you may call us personally at <<NUMBER>> (Jon) or <<NUMBER>> (Arthur).

Thanks very much for considering our request.

All the best,

Jon A. Krosnick, Ph.D.   Arthur Lupia, Ph.D.
Director   Director
American National Election Studies   American National Election Studies
Stanford University   University of Michigan

136

<<DATE >>

<<TITLE>><<FIRST>><<LAST>>
<<ADDRESS1>>
<<CITY>><<STATE>><<ZIP>>

Dear <<TITLE>><<LAST>>:

Thank you very much for talking with our interviewer, who called to ask you to participate in the 2006 American National Election Study. We understand that you told him or her that you're very busy, so it's difficult to find time in your schedule to complete the interview.

We know what you mean. Our schedules are also extremely busy, and that makes it tough to fit in extra things. So we set up our system to make this as easy as possible for you.

First, we can call you any time of the day or night to complete the interview whenever it would be most convenient for you. Just let us know what would work best, and we'll see to it that someone calls you then.

Second, if you prefer not to complete the interview all at once, we can break it up into a few short conversations. We can ask as many questions as you like during the first conversation, and then we can set a convenient time to call you back and continue later.

Third, if things are especially busy for you these days, we can wait a few weeks to do the interview after your schedule has eased up.

And if there is something else that we can do to make this easy for you, just let us know – we'll do the best we can.

You were selected because you completed an interview with us in 2004, and that makes you irreplaceable. In our scientific sample of people, you represent many thousands of citizens like you. We want to be sure that our survey includes the opinions and experiences of all of these people, but only you were interviewed two years ago, so we cannot replace you with someone else.

If you're willing, it would be wonderful if you would call our interviewing firm, SRBI, at this toll-free number to arrange a time to be interviewed: <<NUMBER>>. If we don't hear from you, I've asked your interviewer to call you back again. You can just tell him or her when would a convenient time to talk. Just as a reminder: to thank you for your time completing the interview, we can offer you a gift of <<AMT>> dollars.

If you would like to speak with us about this study. you may call us personally at <<NUMBER>> (Jon) or <<NUMBER>> (Arthur).

Thanks very much for considering our request.

All the best,

Jon A. Krosnick, Ph.D.
Director, American National Election Studies
Stanford University

Arthur Lupia, Ph.D.
Director, American National Election Studies
University of Michigan

<<DATE >>

<<TITLE>><<FIRST>><<LAST>>
<<ADDRESS1>>
<<ADDRESS2>>
<<CITY>><<STATE>><<ZIP>>

Dear <<TITLE>><<LAST>>:

We hope you got the letter we sent you several weeks ago, thanking you for helping us
two years ago, when you were kind enough to be interviewed for the 2004 American
National Election Study survey. At that time, you were a part of the nation's most
important study of voters' thinking at the time of the 2004 presidential election, and we
are very grateful to you.

We also mentioned that we are hoping that we may speak with you one last time. In the
coming weeks, we will be interviewing everyone we spoke with in 2004, this time for
the 2006 American National Election Study survey.

Recently, our interviewers have tried to contact you by telephoning your home, but they
have been unable to reach you. So that we can accurately understand changes in
opinions and experiences of all Americans during the last two years, it's important that
we speak with you again. We hope very much that you will be willing to speak with
our interviewer.

If you're willing, it would be wonderful if you would call our interviewing firm, SRBI,
at this toll-free number to arrange a time to be interviewed: <<NUMBER>>.

Just as a reminder: To thank you for your time completing the interview, we can offer
you a gift of <<AMT>> dollars.

If you would like to speak with us about this study, you may call us personally at
<<NUMBER>> (Jon) or <<NUMBER>> (Arthur).

Thanks very much for considering our request.

All the best,

Jon A. Krosnick, Ph.D.
Director, American National Election Studies
Stanford University

Arthur Lupia, Ph.D.
Director, American National Election Studies
University of Michigan

PS – You may also contact the Stanford University Institutional Review Board (IRB) at <<NUMBER>>, or
you may write the Stanford IRB, Administrative Panels Office, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305-
5401. The interviews will last about 45 minutes on average and will ask about your opinions and
experiences in various areas of life. There are no risks associated with participating in this study. After
you begin the interview, you may stop at any time and still receive our thank-you gift.

<<DATE >>

<<TITLE>><<FIRST>><<LAST>>
<<ADDRESS1>>
<<ADDRESS2>>
<<CITY>><<STATE>><<ZIP>>

Dear <<TITLE>><<LAST>>:

Thank you very much for talking with our interviewer, who called to ask you to participate in the 2006 American National Election Study.

We are grateful that you started the interview and are hopeful that you might be able to complete the interview at some time in the coming weeks. You were selected because you completed an interview with us in 2004, and that makes you irreplaceable.

We will make it as easy as possible for you to finish your interview. We can call you whenever it would be most convenient for you, and if things are especially busy for you these days, we can wait a few weeks to do the interview after your schedule has eased up.

And if there is anything else that we can do to make this easy for you, just let us know – we'll do everything we can.

If you're willing, it would be wonderful if you would call our interviewing firm, SRBI, at this toll-free number to arrange a time to be interviewed: <<NUMBER>>.

If we don't hear from you, we've asked an interviewer to call you back again. You can just tell him or her when would a convenient time to talk.

Just as a reminder: to thank you for your time doing the interview, we can offer you a **gift of <<AMT>> dollars**.

If you would like to speak with us about this study. you may call us personally at <<NUMBER>> (Jon) or <<NUMBER>> (Arthur).

Thanks very much for considering our request.

All the best,

Jon A. Krosnick, Ph.D.
Director, American National Election Studies
Stanford University

Arthur Lupia, Ph.D.
Director, American National Election Studies
University of Michigan

<<DATE >>

<<TITLE>><<FIRST>><<LAST>>
<<ADDRESS1>>
<<ADDRESS2>>
<<CITY>><<STATE>><<ZIP>>

Dear <<TITLE>><<LAST>>:

Thank you very much for talking with our interviewer, who called to ask you to participate in the 2006 American National Election Study. We understand that you expressed a concern about being sure that your answers to our questions will be kept confidential.

As you might remember from the interview we did with you two years ago, the questions we ask are intended to learn about you and your opinions about politics. We never connect your name with your answers at any time.

And we work hard to be sure that no one can ever find out who was interviewed for our surveys. In fact, in the over 50 years since the National Election Study began conducting surveys in 1948, we have interviewed more than 40,000 Americans, and not one of their identities has ever been revealed to anyone.

After is it made completely anonymous, the information collected in our surveys is combined together and analyzed statistically by researchers studying how the American political system is working.

It would be a big help to us if you would be kind enough to complete an interview with us this year, once last time. You were selected because you completed an interview with us in 2004, and that makes you irreplaceable. In our scientific sample of people, you represent many thousands of citizens like you. We want to be sure that our survey includes the opinions and experiences of all of these people, but only you were interviewed two years ago, so we cannot replace you with someone else.

If you're willing, it would be wonderful if you would call our interviewing firm, SRBI, at this toll-free number to arrange a time to be interviewed: <<NUMBER>>. If we don't hear from you, I've asked your interviewer to call you back again. You can just tell him or her when would a convenient time to talk. Just as a reminder, to thank you for your time completing the interview, we can offer you a gift of <<AMT>> dollars.

If you would like to speak with us about this study. you may call us personally at <<NUMBER>> (Jon) or <<NUMBER>> (Arthur).

Thanks very much for considering our request.

All the best,

Jon A. Krosnick, Ph.D.
Director, American National Election Studies
Stanford University

Arthur Lupia, Ph.D.
Director, American National Election Studies
University of Michigan

<<DATE >>

<<TITLE>><<FIRST>><<LAST>>
<<ADDRESS1>>
<<ADDRESS2>>
<<CITY>><<STATE>><<ZIP>>

Dear <<TITLE>><<LAST>>:

Thank you very much for talking with our interviewer, who called to ask you to participate in the 2006 American National Election Study. We understand that you told him or her that you're not interested in politics.

We just wanted to let you know that that makes it especially important for us to conduct an interview with you.

We're sure it won't surprise you to learn that people who are interested in politics are always eager to talk with us when we call to conduct an interview on the subject. But in order for our survey to accurately represent the opinions and experiences of all Americans, we need to conduct interviews with people who are not so interested in politics as well.

You were selected to be interviewed now because you completed an interview with us in 2004, and that makes you irreplaceable. In our scientific sample of people, you represent many thousands of citizens like you. To be sure that these people are included in our statistics, we cannot replace you with someone else, because only you were interviewed two years ago.

We have set up our interviewing system to make it as easy as possible for you to complete the interview.

First, we can call you any time of the day or night to complete the interview whenever would be most convenient for you. Just let us know what would work best, and we'll see to it that someone calls you then.

Second, if you prefer not to complete the interview all at once, we can break it up into a few short conversations. We can ask as many questions as you like during the first conversation, and then we can set a convenient time to call you back and continue with the questions later.

Third, if things are especially busy for you these days, we can wait a few weeks to do the interview after your schedule has eased up.

And if there is something else that we can do to make this easy for you, just let us know – we'll do the best we can.

If you're willing, it would be wonderful if you would call our interviewing firm, SRBI, at this toll-free number to arrange a time to be interviewed: <<NUMBER>>.

If we don't hear from you, I've asked your interviewer to call you back again. You can just tell him or her when would a convenient time to talk.

Just as a reminder: to thank you for your time completing the interview, we can offer you a gift of <<AMT>> dollars.

141

If you would like to speak with us about this study, you may call us personally at <<NUMBER>> (Jon) or <<NUMBER>> (Arthur).

Thanks very much for considering our request.

All the best,

Jon A. Krosnick, Ph.D.
Director, American National Election Studies
Stanford University

Arthur Lupia, Ph.D.
Director, American National Election Studies
University of Michigan

<<DATE >>

<<TITLE>><<FIRST>><<LAST>>
<<ADDRESS1>>
<<ADDRESS2>>
<<CITY>><<STATE>><<ZIP>>

Dear <<TITLE>><<LAST>>:

Thank you very much for talking with the interviewer from SRBI, who called to ask you to be interviewed for the 2006 American National Election Study.

The only people we can interview for this survey are people who we interviewed in 2004, so that means we cannot replace you with anyone else, and we're very hopeful that we might be able to reach you at another time when you might be able to complete the interview.

The interview is easy to do, and most find it interesting and enjoyable. And to thank you for your time doing the interview, we can offer you a gift of **50 dollars**.

You may skip answering any question if you would like to. We will never connect your name with your answers to the questions, and the results will only be reported combining everyone who answers as a group.

We can call you at any time you like to complete the interview. If you would like to spread the interview over a few short conversations during a few days, we can do that, too.

If we can do anything else to make this easy for you, please let us know – we'll do our best to do what you'd prefer.

If you're willing, we would be grateful if you would please call our interviewing firm, SRBI, at this toll-free number to arrange a time to be interviewed: <<NUMBER>>.

If you would like to speak with us about this study, you may call us personally at <<NUMBER>> (Jon) or <<NUMBER>> (Arthur).

Thanks very much for considering our request.

All the best,

Jon A. Krosnick, Ph.D.
Director
American National Election Studies
Stanford University

Arthur Lupia, Ph.D.
Director
American National Election Studies
University of Michigan

<<DATE >>

<<TITLE>><<FIRST>><<LAST>>
<<ADDRESS1>>
<<ADDRESS2>>
<<CITY>><<STATE>><<ZIP>>

Dear <<TITLE>><<LAST>>:

A few weeks ago, we sent you a letter thanking you for being a part of the 2004 American National Election Study. For a few weeks now, our interviewers have been trying to reach you by phone to ask if you would like to participate in our 2006 survey. However, we have been unable to reach you and are hoping you will give us a call.

If you interview before December 22, we can offer you a gift of 100 dollars.

To participate in our 2006 survey, please call our interviewing firm, SRBI, at this toll-free number to arrange a time to be interviewed: <<NUMBER>>.

You are irreplaceable to us because you are part of a very small group of people who were interviewed in 2004. That's why we can give you $100 for this telephone interview, which usually takes 35 to 40 minutes.

If you would like to speak with us about this study, you may call us personally at <<NUMBER>> (Jon) or <<NUMBER>> (Arthur).*

Thanks very much for considering our request.

All the best,

Jon A. Krosnick, Ph.D.
Director, American National Election Studies
Stanford University

Arthur Lupia, Ph.D.
Director, American National Election Studies
University of Michigan

* You may also contact the Stanford University Institutional Review Board (IRB) at <<NUMBER>>, or you may write the Stanford IRB, Administrative Panels Office, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305-5401. The voluntary and confidential interview lasts 40 minutes or less, on average, and will ask about your opinions and experiences in various areas of life. There are no risks associated with participating in this study. After you begin the interview, you may stop at any time and still receive our thank-you gift.

<<DATE >>

<<TITLE>><<FIRST>><<LAST>>
<<ADDRESS1>>
<<ADDRESS2>>
<<CITY>><<STATE>><<ZIP>>

Dear <<TITLE>><<LAST>>:

I understand that you have not yet been able to do the interview for the 2006 American National Election Study.

If you interview before December 22, we'll give you 100 dollars.

You are irreplaceable to us because you are part of a very small group of people who were interviewed in 2004. That's why we can give you $100 for this telephone interview, which usually takes 35 to 40 minutes.

To do the interview, please call our interviewing firm, SRBI, at this toll-free number to arrange a convenient time: <<NUMBER>>.

This is a voluntary university research survey, and not for profit. Our mission is solely to learn about people's opinions, and all your answers are confidential. I hope you'll be pleased to play an essential part in making this a successful project.

Sincerely,

Matthew DeBell, Ph.D.
Director of Stanford Operations
American National Election Studies
Stanford University
<<NUMBER>>

TO: Mr./Ms. First Name/Name
        Fax

        FROM: Dean Williams
        SRBI, Inc. on behalf of Stanford University and the Univ. of Michigan
        [phone number]
        fax [fax number]

DATE:

RE: Phoning [first name/last name]

My records indicate that this number belongs to [first name/last name], who I am trying to reach on the telephone.

If you know how I can reach [first name/last name], I would really appreciate it if you would fax me a telephone number or call me at [phone number]. I am happy to accept a collect call.

I apologize if I have the wrong number.

Sincerely,

Dean Williams

Appendix D: Interviewer Training Materials

This appendix contains the following materials provided to SRBI interviewers working on the 2006 ANES Pilot Study:

- 2006 American National Election Study (ANES): Guide to Promoting Respondent Cooperation
- #3860 2006 ANES Pilot Study – Responses to commonly asked questions
- Encouraging Cooperation

2006 American National Election Study (ANES): Guide to Promoting Respondent Cooperation

Our goal for the 2006 ANES Pilot Study is to interview 72% of the people in the sample. To help achieve that high response rate, this guide reviews the purpose of the study and effective strategies that will help you promote respondent cooperation.

Mission of the American National Election Studies

The mission of the American National Election Studies (ANES) is to produce high quality data on voting, public opinion, and political participation that serve the research needs of social scientists, teachers, students, policy makers and journalists concerned with the theoretical and empirical foundations of mass politics in a democratic society. Central to this mission is the active involvement of the ANES research community in all phases of the project from study planning through data analysis.

The American National Election Studies have been conducted during every national election since 1948, measuring the wants, aspirations, and political behavior of American citizens for over 50 years. Not only are we able to capture people's feelings and opinions with regard to the particular historical moment, but we are also able to compare present feelings and opinions with those voiced in the past. Without all of you, our interviewers, the high quality associated with these studies would not be attainable.

The ANES is a public good. We do not receive funds for secondary data analysis, as we rely on community of thousands users to serve that purpose. These thousands of scientists, policy makers, journalists, and students rely on the ANES to assess the political, social, and economic life of the nation. Thousands of papers and publications have used ANES data.

The ANES is nonpartisan and receives no funding from candidates or political campaigns. The ANES has been officially designated as a *national resource* by the National Science Foundation. All of our data that do not pose a risk to respondent confidentiality are available for free, immediate download from our website at "www.electionstudies.org".

ANES 2006 Pilot Study Overview

A pilot study is one intended to test an instrument or procedure before a larger study is undertaken. The 2006 Pilot Study of the ANES is designed to test new survey questions which will be included in studies of the 2008 presidential election and later elections.

The ANES 2006 Pilot Study sample consists of respondents who have interviewed with us previously, which increases the likelihood that they will be willing to participate again. You already have an established credibility with them from their having participated in past National Election Studies conducted by the University of Michigan. And you are a very experienced set of interviewers – your knowledge, skill set, positive attitude, and energy will affect the results of the study in a very positive and significant way.

Our goal is to interview about 72% of the 1,211 people in the sample. SRBI and ANES are doing a number of things to assist you in reaching that goal:

- Just prior to the beginning of the field period, SRBI mailed an advance letter to each respondent. The mailing included a $2 bill.

- Each respondent is offered either $20 or $50 as an incentive to interview with you – whatever is the maximum amount that was offered to them in prior studies.

- Throughout the field period, SRBI will send out specialized letters to respondents who have expressed a specific concern to you – reluctance to interview, lack of interest in politics, and so on.

- For cases that are proving difficult to reach or interview, ANES will research the case in their archives for additional information or advice that may be helpful in gaining the completion.

Getting the Interview

Our experience with ANES is that interviewers are most effective in gaining an interview when they are given some leeway in how to reassure a reluctant participant. Although the interview has a script that generally must be read verbatim, it is necessary to be responsive to respondents' concerns. That means using your own words to persuade a reluctant respondent to cooperate at the introduction.

You know what phrases you are personally most comfortable with and effective at presenting. Likewise, you are the one on the phone with the respondent and you may have intuitions about how to answer questions or customize the introduction in a way that will be most effective with them. The following tips may help in choosing your words.

Identify the source of reluctance. "What questions or concerns can I answer?"

Use a softening statement. "I know how you feel."

Acknowledge the legitimacy of respondent's concern. "I understand you're busy," or "Many people ask me that question."

Answer respondents' questions. There are a number of questions we have commonly been asked by respondents over the years. A list of them is included in the "Responses to commonly asked questions" sheet that you received at training. A copy is at the end of this document. Review that list so you'll easily be able to give prompt, effective answers to respondents' questions.

If the respondent is irritated, apologize. "I do apologize for having to contact your household once again, but if this were not as important as it is, I would never risk bothering you. Since this is the last wave of the study, the quality of our research depends on interviewing as many of the original participants as possible. We'd really appreciate your participation this one last time. And as a token of our appreciation, we will again be able to provide you a check in the amount of [AMOUNT] as a small "thank you" for your help."

Ease into the interview. If the respondent won't agree to "do the interview," it may be easier to secure cooperation to "start the interview." This is like going down a slippery slope; once they've gotten started, they're more likely to finish. You could suggest, "Let's get started with the first few questions, and if we come to any questions you prefer not to answer, just let me know and we can skip them."

When warranted, offer a callback appointment. Listen to your respondents. Adapt to their situation and needs. Do they seem tired, not in good health, apprehensive? Are you calling at a time that disrupts their routine? We are asking respondents to help us with our work and want to do all we can to fit into their schedule. Perhaps just the suggestion of setting an appointment, or

providing more information on the study, may mean the difference between an interview and a refusal.

A few other tips:
- Emphasize how you will help the respondent complete the survey
- Don't ask questions that can be easily answered with "Yes" or "No". You might hear something you wished you hadn't asked for.
- Keep it simple.
- Use your own words.
- Make specific appointments and verify them.
- If asked "how much longer is this going to take?", a good strategy is to say "not much longer" rather than set a specific expectation in the respondent's mind.

To follow are some phrases that past ANES interviewers have found helpful for getting reluctant participants to start, and for addressing respondent concerns expressed during the front end of the instrument.

- We know your time is valuable, and so we are happy to mail you a check in the amount of <amount> to thank you for your participation.

- Let's get started with the first few questions, and if we come to any questions you prefer not to answer, just let me know and we can skip them.

- You should have received a letter from the University of Michigan and Stanford University telling you about this survey.

- We estimate that the survey will require no more than 45 minutes of your time.

- I would be glad to set up a call at a time that is more convenient for you.

- We have found that people find the questions to be interesting.

- The results of this survey are used to guide scholars and policymakers in making decisions that affect Americans like you.

- We can't just interview someone else. Because we use strict scientific methods to select whom to interview, it is important that we interview you. If we do not interview you, we risk missing out on the opinions of persons like yourself.

- We only contact 1 person in 150,000. It is important for you to make your voice heard so that your opinion counts.

- All answers are treated as strictly confidential. Names, address, and all other identifying information are separated from your answers. The identity of participants or any information that could lead to identifying participants will *never* be released.

- The American National Election Studies have been conducted for the past 58 years and are generally recognized as the best source of objective information on American elections.

- We are not selling anything or doing any kind of fundraising.

- The questions we ask are based on your opinions. There are no right or wrong answers. We are interested in the opinions of people who know a lot about politics and of people who don't know much about politics and aren't interested in politics at all.

Thank You!

Your work as an interviewer is as essential to the success of ANES as the cooperation of the respondents who graciously share their time and opinions with us. The quality of the data we provide to researchers demands that each interview be taken with the highest regard for all interviewing procedures and protocols. We thank you for that, and very much appreciate your efforts to make ANES a continuing success.

#3860 2006 ANES Pilot Study – Responses to commonly asked questions

General Concerns

What is this about?

"The purpose of the study is to investigate how people go about making a wide range of political decisions, how they arrive at a certain position on a current issue, or on what it means to be an American. Investigating these topics offers a lot of valuable information about what U.S. citizens are satisfied (or dissatisfied) with about their government and what they would like to see changed. The study is important because it documents how people feel about important and complex political issues. By collecting this information each election year we gain a better understanding not only of current opinions and behaviors, and also how they change over time**." If respondent requests a source for more information, offer web site www.electionstudies.org If respondent has questions about the study, provide phone number for Dr. Jon Krosnick 1-650-725-3031. If respondent wants to talk to an independent third-party about the legitimacy of the study, they should contact Stanford University IRB at 1-866-890-2906.**

What kind of questions are in your survey?

"We will be asking about people's feelings and opinions about a variety of topics, including the social and political issues, values, and patriotism. There are no wrong answers. We would like to hear all the different sentiments and opinions of everybody. Each person's answers are equally important in helping to 'paint a picture' of the nation as a whole."

Who is this for?

"The content of the study is determined by scholars at Stanford University and the University of Michigan and scholars from other universities who are interested in electoral research. The National Election Studies have been conducting national surveys for over 50 years.

How will this help me? What's in it for me?

"Providing your opinions, views and concerns gives you a chance to influence the development of policies that have an impact on the life of people like you. We will pay you as a thank-you for being interviewed, and we have found that many people enjoy being interviewed."

Surveys are a waste of time and money.

"Some people feel that way. But the opinions and views of people in this country are important, and our survey uses a scientific sample to find out what people's opinions and views are. Your contribution will help in a very real way to improve our knowledge of how our society and government work."

Time Concerns

I'm Too Busy

"I know exactly what you mean! Of course we do this totally at your convenience and I have done so many of these that we can zip right through it. Many people tell me that they enjoy the interview and they're finished in no time."

How long is this going to take?

This question may be a signal that the R is preparing to do the interview and just needs a little gentle prodding to begin. You might proactively respond with: "It depends on the length of your answers. How about if we just get started and if you run out of time, let me know and we'll arrange to finish at another time." If the R wants to know the average time, you can say "about 45 minutes on average."

Confidentiality Concerns

Concerns about confidentiality may stem from the R's fear that we will share sensitive information that will impact their privacy. R may have strong feelings about government intrusion into the lives of Americans. R may have just viewed a network television program about telephone scams. Or R may simply have some doubts about the legitimacy of the study. Your task is to defuse these concerns by emphasizing the confidential nature of the data collection. The earnestness and confidence with which you deliver this information will oftentimes be more convincing than the words you actually use. Your job is to reassure the R that the data are held in strict confidence.

I don't give out personal information.

"If there is any particular question you don't want to answer, that's fine, and I can skip to the next one. Participants may refuse to answer any or all questions. However, we have found that people enjoy being interviewed."

What will happen to my answers?
"The data collected are research-oriented and used primarily by students and scholars of American politics and government at colleges and universities across the nation. All answers are treated as strictly confidential. Completed interviews are sent in a secure fashion to our data processing facility in Ann Arbor, Michigan."

Political/Knowledge Concerns

Concerns in this area may result from R's misperception of what the survey request entails. Some Rs may think that they need to brush up on their civics lessons to "do well" on the interview. Others may think that they have to vote to qualify. In some cases, Rs may be expressing resentment about the government or a feel that they "really don't matter." Your task is to zero-in on what R's concern is by emphasizing how no special expertise is required, how important it is for the R's voice to be heard, or how it's especially important for us to talk with people who didn't vote.

 I don't know anything about politics.

"That's fine. Lots of people say that. Don't worry, you don't need to know anything about politics to be a great help to us. Your opinions are all we're after…"

I don't vote/I'm not interested in politics.

"That's just the kind of thing we need to find out. People in government need to hear why people out here are not interested in what's happening in Washington. This is your chance to really have your voice be heard…"

I'm not registered to vote.
"We interview people all the time who have never voted. In a way, participating in the study is like voting: it gives you a chance to make sure your voice gets heard. After the interview, people often tell us how glad they were to participate…"

Age/Health concerns

Older respondents may be fearful that they will appear "stupid" or they may have health concerns that are an issue. Maybe they are heavily involved with caring for a loved one or dealing with loneliness or heightened stress around the holidays. They may fear that the survey will be lengthy or complicated. Your task is to demonstrate patience and caring in addressing these concerns by emphasizing how you will be an ally in helping them through the interview, that there are no right or wrong answers etc.

I'm not feeling well.

"I'm sorry to hear that you aren't feeling well. Sometimes we call at the worst time, but we only have a limited time left to complete our project. You are so very important to our study. Maybe it would make more sense to do just a few minutes today, then I can call you back and finish it up in a couple days. How does that sound?"

I'm too old to care about doing a survey.

"I have had many days myself when I've felt that way." (If available, related story about interviewing some other older person). "You know, a person's never too old to care and everyone seems to have opinions. For over 50 years this study has been helping scholars and policymakers better understand what's going on in the country. We really need to find out the opinions of people at all ages."

Encouraging Cooperation

What is this for?
- The purpose of the study is to understand what Americans think about elections.

- We are investigating how people go about making a wide range of political decisions, how they arrive at a certain position on a current issue, or on what it means to be an American. Investigating these topics offers a lot of valuable information about what U.S. citizens are satisfied or dissatisfied with about their government, and what they would like to see changed.

What do you do with my answers?
- There is no information attached to your answers that could identify you. The confidential data are used by scholars and students to learn about American politics and to learn what the public thinks.

Why don't you interview somebody else?
- We have to interview the same person who completed the 2004 survey in order to be able to compare results.

- You are one of 1,212 people we are contacting for this study. The success of this study depends on our ability to complete interviews with as many people as possible.

I'm too busy. I don't have time right now.
- I would be glad to set up a call at a time that is more convenient for you.

- We can start with the first few questions now, and I can call back later to finish whenever you like.

I said no the last time you called.
- I do apologize for having to contact your household once again, but if this were not as important as it is, I would never risk bothering you. Since this is the last wave of the study, the quality of our research depends on interviewing as many of the original participants as possible. We'd really appreciate your participation this one last time. And as a token of our appreciation, we will again be able to provide you a check in the amount of [AMOUNT] as a small "thank you" for your help.

I'm not interested.
- We know your time is valuable, and so we are happy to mail you a check in the amount of <amount> to thank you for your participation.

- This study is important because the results of this survey are used to guide scholars and policymakers in making decisions that affect Americans like you.

I'm not interested in politics.
- That's just the kind of thing we need to find out. We want to learn why people are or aren't interested in what's happening in government.

Appendix E: Derived Variable Code

This appendix contains SAS program code used to create several summary variables for the 2006 ANES Pilot Study. The variables to which the code in this appendix applies are as follows:

```
V06P504x   Mod3_2-5x. SUMMARY: R likes or dislikes unpredictable situations
V06P554x   Mod10_3-5x. SUMMARY: R religious service attendance
V06P567x   Mod12_A1-A3. SUMMARY: R optimism/pessimism own future (VERSION 1)
V06P572x   Mod12_A5-A7. SUMMARY: R optimism/pessimism U.S. future (VERSION 1)
V06P577x   Mod12_B1-B3. SUMMARY: R optimism/pessimism own future (VERSION 2)
V06P582x   Mod12_B5-B7. SUMMARY: R optimism/pessimism U.S. future (VERSION 2)
V06P591x   Mod13_4_1x. SUMMARY: Total frequency R talked with Network person#1
V06P593x   Mod13_4_2x. SUMMARY: Total frequency R talked with Network person#2
V06P595x   Mod13_4_3x. SUMMARY: Total frequency R talked with Network person#3
V06P596x   Mod13_5x. SUMMARY: Total freq talked - 2 total network mentions
V06P597x   Mod13_6_pair1x. SUMMARY: Total freq network #1,#2 talked (3/more)
V06P598x   Mod13_6_pair2x. SUMMARY: Total freq network #1,#3 talked (3/more)
V06P599x   Mod13_6_pair3x. SUMMARY: Total freq network #2,#3 talked (3/more)
V06P603x   Mod13_8_1x. SUMMARY: Party ID network mention #1
V06P608x   Mod13_8_2x. SUMMARY: Party ID network mention #2
V06P613x   Mod13_8_3x. SUMMARY: Party ID network mention #3
V06P641    Mod15_7. Number of likes about federal government
V06P643    Mod15_9. Number of dislikes about federal government
V06P665x   Mod18_A2x. SUMMARY: minutes reading internet news (VERSION 1)
V06P667x   Mod18_A4x. SUMMARY: minutes reading print news (VERSION 1)
V06P669x   Mod18_A6x. SUMMARY: minutes watching news on TV (VERSION 1)
V06P671x   Mod18_A8x. SUMMARY: minutes hearing news on radio (VERSION 1)
V06P673x   Mod18_B2x. SUMMARY: minutes reading internet news (VERSION 2)
V06P675x   Mod18_B4x. SUMMARY: minutes reading print news (VERSION 2)
V06P677x   Mod18_B6x. SUMMARY: minutes watching news on TV (VERSION 2)
V06P679x   Mod18_B8x. SUMMARY: minutes hearing news on radio (VERSION 2)
V06P689x   Mod20_A1-A4. SUMMARY: abortion if pregn nonfatally injures woman
V06P695x   Mod20_A6-A9x. SUMMARY: abortion if pregnancy fatally injure woman
V06P701x   Mod20_A11-A14x. SUMMARY: abortion if pregnancy due to incest
V06P707x   Mod20_A16-A19x. SUMMARY: abortion if pregnancy due to rape
V06P713x   Mod20_A21-A24x. SUMMARY: abortion if pregn has serious birth defect
V06P719x   Mod20_A26-A29x. SUMMARY: abortion if child is not the desired sex
V06P725x   Mod20_A31-A34x. SUMMARY: abortion if child would be finan hardship
V06P737    Mod23_A/B. SUMMARY: chances vote for woman Pres cand (2 VERSIONS)
V06P737x   Mod23_A1-A2x. SUMMARY: chances vote for woman Pres cand (VERSION 1)
V06P740x   Mod23_B1-B2x. SUMMARY: chances vote for woman Pres cand (VERSION 2)
V06P744x   Mod23_4-5x. SUMMARY: men/women better suited to work in govt
V06P747x   Mod23_6-7x. SUMMARY: man/woman Dem in Congress better on crime
V06P750x   Mod23_8-9x. SUMMARY: man/woman Dem in Congress better on education
V06P753x   Mod23_10-11x. SUMMARY: man/woman Repub in Congress better on crime
V06P756x   Mod23_12-13x. SUMMARY: man/woman Repub in Congress better on educ
V06P759x   Mod23_14-15x. SUMMARY: man/woman Dem in Congress support abort
V06P762x   Mod23_16-17x. SUMMARY: man/woman Repub in Congress support abort
V06P775x   Mod26_2summ. SUMMARY: Did R vote election day (VERSION 1/VERSION 2)
V06P788x   Mod27_1/A2-A4x. SUMMARY: VERSION 1 approve Bush job as President
V06P789x   Mod27_1/B2-B4x. SUMMARY: VERSION 2 approve Bush job as President
V06P793x   Mod27_5/A6-A8x. SUMMARY: VERSION 1 approve Bush job on economy
V06P794x   Mod27_5/B6-B8x. SUMMARY: VERSION 2 approve Bush job on economy
V06P798x   Mod27_9/A10-A12x. SUMMARY: VERSION 1 approve Bush job foreign rel
V06P799x   Mod27_9/B10-B12x. SUMMARY: VERSION 2 approve Bush job foreign rel
V06P803x   Mod27_13/A14-A16x. SUMMARY: VERSION 1 approve Bush on terrorism
V06P804x   Mod27_13/B14-B16x. SUMMARY: VERSION 2 approve Bush on terrorism
```

The code in this appendix is not a complete SAS program. The actual program used to create the release dataset contains some recodes of individual cases based on data that cannot be publicly released because it contains individually identifiable information. However, the code segments in his appendix convey the logical approach taken to creating the summary variables.

Below, variables are listed in boldface above the applicable code segment.

V06P591x, V06P593x, V06P595x, V06P596x, V06P597x, V06P598x, V06P599x

```
* ;
  V06P591x = Mod13_4_1days ;
  if V06P591 = 2 then V06P591x = 183 ;
  if V06P591 = 3 then V06P591x = Mod13_4_1perweek*26 ;
  if V06P591 = 4 then V06P591x = Mod13_4_1permonth*6 ;
  if Mod13_4_1days eq 888 then V06P591 = 8 ;
  if Mod13_4_1days eq 999 then V06P591 = 9 ;
  if V06P591 eq 8 then V06P591x = 8888 ;
  if V06P591 eq 9 then V06P591x = 9999 ;
* ;
  V06P593x = Mod13_4_2days ;
  if V06P593 = 2 then V06P593x = 183 ;
  if V06P593 = 3 then V06P593x = Mod13_4_2perweek*26 ;
  if V06P593 = 4 then V06P593x = Mod13_4_2permonth*6 ;
  if Mod13_4_2days eq 888 then V06P593 = 8 ;
  if Mod13_4_2days eq 999 then V06P593 = 9 ;
  if V06P593 eq 8 then V06P593x = 8888 ;
  if V06P593 eq 9 then V06P593x = 9999 ;
  if V06P593x eq 185 then V06P593x =183 ;
* ;
  V06P595x = Mod13_4_3days ;
  if V06P595 = 2 then V06P595x = 183 ;
  if V06P595 = 3 then V06P595x = Mod13_4_3perweek*26 ;
  if V06P595 = 4 then V06P595x = Mod13_4_3permonth*6 ;
  if Mod13_4_3days eq 888 then V06P595 = 8 ;
  if Mod13_4_3days eq 999 then V06P595 = 9 ;
  if V06P595 eq 8 then V06P595x = 8888 ;
  if V06P595 eq 9 then V06P595x = 9999 ;
  if V06P595x eq 185 then V06P595x =183 ;
* ;
  V06P596x = Mod13_5days ;
  if V06P596 = 2 then V06P596x = 183 ;
  if V06P596 = 3 then V06P596x = Mod13_5perweek*26 ;
  if V06P596 = 4 then V06P596x = Mod13_5permonth*6 ;
  if V06P596 eq 5 then V06P596x = 0 ;
  if Mod13_5days eq 888 then V06P596 = 8 ;
  if Mod13_5days eq 999 then V06P596 = 9 ;
  if V06P596 eq 8 then V06P596x = 8888 ;
  if V06P596 eq 9 then V06P596x = 9999 ;
* ;
  V06P597x = Mod13_6_pair1days ;
  if V06P597 = 2 then V06P597x = 183 ;
  if V06P597 = 3 then V06P597x = Mod13_6_pair1perweek*26 ;
  if V06P597 = 4 then V06P597x = Mod13_6_pair1permon*6 ;
  if V06P597 eq 5 then V06P597x = 0 ;
```

```
      if Mod13_6_pair1days eq 888 then V06P597= 8 ;
      if Mod13_6_pair1days eq 999 then V06P597 = 9 ;
      if V06P597 eq 8 then V06P597x = 8888 ;
      if V06P597 eq 9 then V06P597x = 9999 ;
* case other specify but blank fields ;
      if V06P001b eq 335 then V06P597x = 8899 ;
* case '3 months worth of days' ;
      if V06P001b eq 665 then V06P597x = 90 ;
* ;
      V06P598x = Mod13_6_pair2days ;
      if V06P598 = 2 then V06P598x = 183 ;
      if V06P598 = 3 then V06P598x = Mod13_6_pair2perweek*26 ;
      if V06P598 = 4 then V06P598x = Mod13_6_pair2permon*6 ;
      if V06P598 eq 5 then V06P598x = 0 ;
      if Mod13_6_pair2days eq 888 then V06P598= 8 ;
      if Mod13_6_pair2days eq 999 then V06P598 = 9 ;
      if V06P598 eq 8 then V06P598x = 8888 ;
      if V06P598 eq 9 then V06P598x = 9999 ;
* ;
      V06P599x = Mod13_6_pair3days ;
      if V06P599 = 2 then V06P599x = 183 ;
      if V06P599 = 3 then V06P599x = Mod13_6_pair3perweek*26 ;
      if V06P599 = 4 then V06P599x = Mod13_6_pair3permon*6 ;
      if V06P599 eq 5 then V06P599x = 0 ;
      if Mod13_6_pair3days eq 888 then V06P599= 8 ;
      if Mod13_6_pair3days eq 999 then V06P599 = 9 ;
      if V06P599 eq 8 then V06P599x = 8888 ;
      if V06P599 eq 9 then V06P599x = 9999 ;
* cases 661, 443 ;
      if V06P599x eq 185 then V06P599x =183 ;
      if V06P591x eq 1170 then V06P591x = 183 ;
      if V06P597x eq 624 then V06P597x =183 ;
```

V06P603x, V06P608x, V06P613x

```
* ;
* PARTY ID SUMMARY - NETWORK MENTION 1 ;
      if V06P604 eq 1 then do ;
        if V06P605 eq 1        then V06P603x = 0 ;
        if V06P605 in(2,8,9) then V06P603x = 1 ;
        go to NX1 ;
      end ;
      if V06P604 eq 2 then do ;
        if V06P606 eq 1        then V06P603x = 6 ;
        if V06P606 in(2,8,9) then V06P603x = 5 ;
        go to NX1 ;
      end ;
      if V06P604 in(3,5) then do ;
        if V06P607 eq 1        then V06P603x = 2 ;
        if V06P607 eq 3        then V06P603x = 4 ;
        if V06P607 in(5,8,9) then V06P603x = 3 ;
        go to NX1 ;
      end ;
      if V06P604 eq 8 then do ;
        if V06P607 eq 1        then V06P603x = 2 ;
        if V06P607 eq 3        then V06P603x = 4 ;
```

```
       if V06P607 eq 5        then V06P603x = 3 ;
       if V06P607 in(8,9)   then V06P603x = 8 ;
         go to NX1 ;
     end ;
     if V06P604 eq 4 then do ;
       if V06P607 eq 1        then V06P603x = 2 ;
       if V06P607 eq 3        then V06P603x = 4 ;
       if V06P607 in(5,8,9) then V06P603x = 7 ;
     end ;
     if V06P604 eq 9 then V06P603x= 9 ;
   NX1:
   * ;
   * PARTY ID SUMMARY - NETWORK MENTION 2 ;
     if V06P609 eq 1 then do ;
       if V06P610 eq 1        then V06P608x = 0 ;
       if V06P610 in(2,8,9) then V06P608x = 1 ;
         go to NX2 ;
     end ;
     if V06P609 eq 2 then do ;
       if V06P611 eq 1        then V06P608x = 6 ;
       if V06P611 in(2,8,9) then V06P608x = 5 ;
         go to NX2 ;
     end ;
     if V06P609 in(3,5) then do ;
       if V06P612 eq 1        then V06P608x = 2 ;
       if V06P612 eq 3        then V06P608x = 4 ;
       if V06P612 in(5,8,9) then V06P608x = 3 ;
         go to NX2 ;
     end ;
     if V06P609 eq 8 then do ;
       if V06P612 eq 1        then V06P608x = 2 ;
       if V06P612 eq 3        then V06P608x = 4 ;
       if V06P612 eq 5        then V06P608x = 3 ;
       if V06P612 in(8,9)   then V06P608x = 8 ;
         go to NX2 ;
     end ;
     if V06P609 eq 4 then do ;
       if V06P612 eq 1        then V06P608x = 2 ;
       if V06P612 eq 3        then V06P608x = 4 ;
       if V06P612 in(5,8,9) then V06P608x = 7 ;
     end ;
     if V06P609 eq 9 then V06P608x= 9 ;
   NX2:
   * ;
   * PARTY ID SUMMARY - NETWORK MENTION 3 ;
     if V06P614 eq 1 then do ;
       if V06P615 eq 1        then V06P613x = 0 ;
       if V06P615 in(2,8,9) then V06P613x = 1 ;
         go to NX3 ;
     end ;
     if V06P614 eq 2 then do ;
       if V06P616 eq 1        then V06P613x = 6 ;
       if V06P616 in(2,8,9) then V06P613x = 5 ;
         go to NX3 ;
     end ;
     if V06P614 in(3,5) then do ;
       if V06P617 eq 1        then V06P613x = 2 ;
```

159

```
     if V06P617 eq 3        then V06P613x = 4 ;
     if V06P617 in(5,8,9) then V06P613x = 3 ;
      go to NX3 ;
   end ;
   if V06P614 eq 8 then do ;
     if V06P617 eq 1        then V06P613x = 2 ;
     if V06P617 eq 3        then V06P613x = 4 ;
     if V06P617 eq 5        then V06P613x = 3 ;
     if V06P617 in(8,9)   then V06P613x = 8 ;
      go to NX3 ;
   end ;
   if V06P614 eq 4 then do ;
     if V06P617 eq 1        then V06P613x = 2 ;
     if V06P617 eq 3        then V06P613x = 4 ;
     if V06P617 in(5,8,9) then V06P613x = 7 ;
   end ;
   if V06P614 eq 9 then V06P613x= 9 ;
NX3:
* ;
```

V06P641, V06P643

```
   if V06P640 in(2,8,9) then V06P641 = 0 ;
   if V06P641a ge 8880 and V06P641a le 9999 then V06P641 = 0 ;
   if V06P641 eq 0 or V06P640 eq . then go to SKIPCT1 ;
   V06P641 = 1 ;
   if V06P641b eq . then do ; V06P641=1 ; go to SKIPCT1; end ;
   if V06P641c eq . then do ; V06P641=2 ; go to SKIPCT1; end ;
   if V06P641d eq . then do ; V06P641=3 ; go to SKIPCT1; end ;
   if V06P641e eq . then do ; V06P641=4 ; go to SKIPCT1; end ;
   if V06P641f eq . then do ; V06P641=5 ; go to SKIPCT1; end ;
   if V06P641f ne . then V06P641=6 ;
SKIPCT1:
* ;
   if V06P642 in(2,8,9) then V06P643 = 0 ;
   if V06P643a ge 8880 and V06P643a le 9999 then V06P643 = 0 ;
   if V06P643 eq 0 or V06P642 eq . then go to SKIPCT2 ;
   V06P643 = 1 ;
   if V06P643b eq . then do ; V06P643=1 ; go to SKIPCT2 ; end ;
   if V06P643c eq . then do ; V06P643=2 ; go to SKIPCT2 ; end ;
   if V06P643d eq . then do ; V06P643=3 ; go to SKIPCT2 ; end ;
   if V06P643e eq . then do ; V06P643=4 ; go to SKIPCT2 ; end ;
   if V06P643f eq . then do ; V06P643=5 ; go to SKIPCT2 ; end ;
   if V06P643g eq . then do ; V06P643=6 ; go to SKIPCT2 ; end ;
   if V06P643h eq . then do ; V06P643=7 ; go to SKIPCT2 ; end ;
   if V06P643j eq . then do ; V06P643=8 ; go to SKIPCT2 ; end ;
   if V06P643k eq . then do ; V06P643=9 ; go to SKIPCT2 ; end ;
   if V06P643m eq . then do ; V06P643=10; go to SKIPCT2 ; end ;
   if V06P643n eq . then do ; V06P643=11; go to SKIPCT2 ; end ;
   if V06P643n ne . then V06P643=12;
SKIPCT2:
```

V06P665x, V06P667x, V06P669x, V06P671x, V06P673x, V06P675x, V06P677x, V06P679x

```
  V06P665x = . ;
  if V06P665 eq 1 then V06P665x = Mod18_A2min ;
  if V06P665 eq 2 then V06P665x = (Mod18_A2hour)*60 ;
  if V06P665 eq 3 then V06P665x = ((Mod18_A2hour)*60)+(Mod18_A2min) ;
  if V06P665 eq 9 then V06P665x = 999 ;
* ;
  V06P667x = . ;
  if V06P667 eq 1 then V06P667x = Mod18_A4min ;
  if V06P667 eq 2 then V06P667x = (Mod18_A4hour)*60 ;
  if V06P667 eq 3 then V06P667x = ((Mod18_A4hour)*60)+(Mod18_A4min) ;
  if V06P667 eq 9 then V06P667x = 999 ;
* ;
  V06P669x = . ;
  if V06P669 eq 1 then V06P669x = Mod18_A6min ;
  if V06P669 eq 2 then V06P669x = (Mod18_A6hour)*60 ;
  if V06P669 eq 3 then V06P669x = ((Mod18_A6hour)*60)+(Mod18_A6min) ;
  if V06P669 eq 9 then V06P669x = 999 ;
* ;
  V06P671x = . ;
  if V06P671 eq 1 then V06P671x = Mod18_A8min ;
  if V06P671 eq 2 then V06P671x = (Mod18_A8hour)*60 ;
  if V06P671 eq 3 then V06P671x = ((Mod18_A8hour)*60)+(Mod18_A8min) ;
  if V06P671 eq 9 then V06P671x = 999 ;
* ;
  V06P673x = . ;
  if V06P673 eq 1 then V06P673x = Mod18_B2min ;
  if V06P673 eq 2 then V06P673x = (Mod18_B2hour)*60 ;
  if V06P673 eq 3 then V06P673x = ((Mod18_B2hour)*60)+(Mod18_B2min) ;
  if V06P673 eq 9 then V06P673x = 999 ;
* ;
  V06P675x = . ;
  if V06P675 eq 1 then V06P675x = Mod18_B4min ;
  if V06P675 eq 2 then V06P675x = (Mod18_B4hour)*60 ;
  if V06P675 eq 3 then V06P675x = ((Mod18_B4hour)*60)+(Mod18_B4min) ;
  if V06P675 eq 9 then V06P675x = 999 ;
* ;
  V06P677x = . ;
  if V06P677 eq 1 then V06P677x = Mod18_B6min ;
  if V06P677 eq 2 then V06P677x = (Mod18_B6hour)*60 ;
  if V06P677 eq 3 then V06P677x = ((Mod18_B6hour)*60)+(Mod18_B6min) ;
  if V06P677 eq 9 then V06P677x = 999 ;
* ;
  V06P679x = . ;
  if V06P679 eq 1 then V06P679x = Mod18_B8min ;
  if V06P679 eq 2 then V06P679x = (Mod18_B8hour)*60 ;
  if V06P679 eq 3 then V06P679x = ((Mod18_B8hour)*60)+(Mod18_B8min) ;
  if V06P679 eq 9 then V06P679x = 999 ;

* ;
  if V06P665x eq 888 then V06P665x = 8888 ;
  if V06P665x eq 999 then V06P665x = 9999 ;
  if V06P667x eq 888 then V06P667x = 8888 ;
  if V06P667x eq 999 then V06P667x = 9999 ;
  if V06P669x eq 888 then V06P669x = 8888 ;
  if V06P669x eq 999 then V06P669x = 9999 ;
  if V06P671x eq 888 then V06P671x = 8888 ;
  if V06P671x eq 999 then V06P671x = 9999 ;
```

```
   if V06P673x eq 888 then V06P673x = 8888 ;
   if V06P673x eq 999 then V06P673x = 9999 ;
   if V06P675x eq 888 then V06P675x = 8888 ;
   if V06P675x eq 999 then V06P675x = 9999 ;
   if V06P677x eq 888 then V06P677x = 8888 ;
   if V06P677x eq 999 then V06P677x = 9999 ;
   if V06P679x eq 888 then V06P679x = 8888 ;
   if V06P679x eq 999 then V06P679x = 9999 ;
```

Summary variables within the range V06P504x through V06P582x and V06P689x through V06P884x (except V06P775x, which is in the code block following this one)

```
%macro scale7(summ7,lead,opt1,opt2,lean);
   if &lead eq 1 then &summ7 = &opt1 ;
   if &opt1 in(8,9) then &summ7 = 2 ;
   if &lead in(3,8) then &summ7 = 4 ;
   if &lean eq 1 then &summ7 = 3 ;
   if &lean eq 2 then &summ7 = 5 ;
   if &lead eq 8 and &lean in(8,9) then &summ7 = 8 ;
   if &opt2 eq 1 then &summ7 = 7 ;
   if &opt2 eq 2 then &summ7 = 6 ;
   if &opt2 in(8,9) then &summ7 = 6 ;
   if &lead eq 9 then &summ7 = 9 ;
%mend scale7 ;
%macro scale9(summ9,leadin,option1,option2,leaner);
   if &leadin eq 1 then &summ9 = &option1 -1 ;
   if &option1 in(8,9) then &summ9 = 1 ;
   if &leadin in(3,8) then &summ9 = 4 ;
   if &leaner eq 1 then &summ9 = 3 ;
   if &leaner eq 2 then &summ9 = 5 ;
   if &leadin eq 8 and &leaner in(8,9) then &summ9 = 9 ;
   if &option2 eq 1 then &summ9 = 8 ;
   if &option2 in(2,8,9) then &summ9 = 7 ;
   if &option2 eq 3 then &summ9 = 6 ;
   if &leadin eq 9 then &summ9 = . ;
%mend scale9 ;
%macro scale7a(summ7,lead,opt1,opt2,lean);
 if V06P434 eq 1 then do ;
   if &lead eq 1 then &summ7 = &opt1 ;
   if &opt1 in(8,9) then &summ7 = 2 ;
   if &lead in(3,8) then &summ7 = 4 ;
   if &lean eq 1 then &summ7 = 3 ;
   if &lean eq 2 then &summ7 = 5 ;
   if &lead eq 8 and &lean in(8,9) then &summ7 = 8 ;
   if &opt2 eq 1 then &summ7 = 7 ;
   if &opt2 eq 2 then &summ7 = 6 ;
   if &opt2 in(8,9) then &summ7 = 6 ;
   if &lead eq 9 then &summ7 = 9 ;
 end ;
%mend scale7a ;
%macro scale9a(summ9,leadin,option1,option2,leaner);
 if V06P434 eq 2 then do ;
   if &leadin eq 1 then &summ9 = &option1 -1 ;
   if &option1 in(8,9) then &summ9 = 1 ;
   if &leadin in(3,8) then &summ9 = 4 ;
   if &leaner eq 1 then &summ9 = 3 ;
```

162

```
   if &leaner eq 2 then &summ9 = 5 ;
   if &leadin eq 8 and &leaner in(8,9) then &summ9 = 9 ;
   if &option2 eq 1 then &summ9 = 8 ;
   if &option2 in(2,8,9) then &summ9 = 7 ;
   if &option2 eq 3 then &summ9 = 6 ;
   if &leadin eq 9 then &summ9 = . ;
 end ;
%mend scale9a ;
%macro summ7(summ,choice,degree);
  &summ = &choice ;
  if &choice eq 3 then &summ = 4 ;
  if &choice eq 1 and &degree = 1 then &summ = 1 ;
  if &choice eq 1 and &degree in(2,8,9) then &summ = 2 ;
  if &choice eq 1 and &degree = 3 then &summ = 3 ;
  if &choice eq 2 and &degree = 3 then &summ = 5 ;
  if &choice eq 2 and &degree in(2,8,9) then &summ = 6 ;
  if &choice eq 2 and &degree = 1 then &summ = 7 ;
%mend summ7;


* ;
%scale9(V06P504x,V06P505,V06P506,V06P507,V06P508)
* ;
  V06P554x = V06P556 ;
  if V06P557 eq 2 then do ; V06P554x = 0 ; go to OUT2 ; end ;
  if V06P555 in(5,9) then do ; V06P554x = V06P555 ; go to OUT2 ; end ;
OUT2:
* ;
%scale9(V06P567x,V06P568,V06P569,V06P570,V06P571)
%scale9(V06P572x,V06P573,V06P574,V06P575,V06P576)
* ;
%scale7(V06P577x,V06P578,V06P579,V06P580,V06P581)
%scale7(V06P582x,V06P583,V06P584,V06P585,V06P586)
* ;
%scale7(V06P689x,V06P690,V06P691,V06P692,V06P693)
%scale7(V06P695x,V06P696,V06P697,V06P698,V06P699)
%scale7(V06P701x,V06P702,V06P703,V06P704,V06P705)
%scale7(V06P707x,V06P708,V06P709,V06P710,V06P711)
%scale7(V06P713x,V06P714,V06P715,V06P716,V06P717)
%scale7(V06P719x,V06P720,V06P721,V06P722,V06P723)
%scale7(V06P725x,V06P726,V06P727,V06P728,V06P729)
* ;
%summ7(V06P737x,V06P738,V06P739)
%summ7(V06P740x,V06P741,V06P742)
%summ7(V06P744x,V06P745,V06P746)
%summ7(V06P747x,V06P748,V06P749)
%summ7(V06P750x,V06P751,V06P752)
%summ7(V06P753x,V06P754,V06P754)
%summ7(V06P756x,V06P757,V06P758)
%summ7(V06P759x,V06P760,V06P761)
%summ7(V06P762x,V06P763,V06P764)
* ;
%scale7a(V06P788x,V06P790,V06P791a,V06P791b,V06P791c)
%scale9a(V06P789x,V06P790,V06P792a,V06P792b,V06P792c)
%scale7a(V06P793x,V06P795,V06P796a,V06P796b,V06P796c)
%scale9a(V06P794x,V06P795,V06P797a,V06P797b,V06P797c)
%scale7a(V06P798x,V06P800,V06P801a,V06P801b,V06P801c)
```

```
%scale9a(V06P799x,V06P800,V06P802a,V06P802b,V06P802c)
%scale7a(V06P803x,V06P805,V06P806a,V06P806b,V06P806c)
%scale9a(V06P804x,V06P805,V06P807a,V06P807b,V06P807c)


if V06P738 ne . then V06P737 = V06P737x ;
if V06P741 ne . then V06P737 = V06P740x ;
```

V06P775x

```
V06P775x = V06P776 ;
if V06P776 eq . then do ;
 V06P775x = V06P779;
  if V06P779 eq 2 then V06P775x =1 ;
  if V06P779 eq 3 then V06P775x =2 ;
  if V06P779 eq 4 then V06P775x =8 ;
end ;
```

Appendix F: Weight Code

This appendix contains the SPSS program code used to create the nonresponse-adjusted weights for the 2006 ANES Pilot Study.

```
* Purpose: Create nonresponse adjustment weights for the 2006 ANES Pilot Study.
* Written by Matthew DeBell, debell at stanford dot edu.
* Created: 20070131.
* Last modified 20070227.
* Status: complete.


* Step 0.
* Merge the 2006 data with the 2004 data, and/or open the file with the merged
data.

GET FILE=
'C:\Documents and Settings\Matthew DeBell\My Documents\ANES\Data\nes2004\NES04-
06merge.sav'.


* Step 1.
*  Assign each of the 1,212 sample members to one of the 24 CPS cells
  based on 2004 age crosstabulated by 2004 ed level, shown in Table C in the
  2004 ANES documentation .
* Eg one cell is age 18-29 and less than a high school diploma, another cell
  is age 18-29 and a high school diploma, etc.

recode v043254 (0 thru 2=1) (3=2) (4 thru 5=3) (6 thru 7 = 4) into ed.
variable label ed 'Educational attainment'.
value labels ed 1 '< HS dip' 2 'HS dip' 3 'some college' 4 'college grad' .
recode v043250 (18 thru 29=1) (30 thru 39=2) (40 thru 49=3) (50 thru 59=4)
  (60 thru 69=5) (70 thru 90=6) into age.
variable label age 'age group'.
value labels age 1 '18-29' 2 '30-39' 3 '40-49' 4 '50-59' 5 '60-69' 6 '70+' .


* Class codes indicate age group with the first digit and ed group with the
second digit.
* The cells that would be 21 and 31 are merged into 30 because cell 21 is empty
for the Pilot dataset.
compute class = -1.
if age=1 and ed=1 class=11.
if age=2 and ed=1 class=30.
if age=3 and ed=1 class=30.
if age=4 and ed=1 class=41.
if age=5 and ed=1 class=51.
if age=6 and ed=1 class=61.
if age=1 and ed=2 class=12.
if age=2 and ed=2 class=22.
if age=3 and ed=2 class=32.
if age=4 and ed=2 class=42.
if age=5 and ed=2 class=52.
if age=6 and ed=2 class=62.
if age=1 and ed=3 class=13.
if age=2 and ed=3 class=23.
if age=3 and ed=3 class=33.
if age=4 and ed=3 class=43.
```

```
if age=5 and ed=3 class=53.
if age=6 and ed=3 class=63.
if age=1 and ed=4 class=14.
if age=2 and ed=4 class=24.
if age=3 and ed=4 class=34.
if age=4 and ed=4 class=44.
if age=5 and ed=4 class=54.
if age=6 and ed=4 class=64.


* Step 2A.
* Sum the 2004 weights for all sample members in the cell.

sort cases by class.
split file layered by class.
freq v040101 /format=notable /statistics=sum.
split file off.
* NOTE: the way I've written this, you have to eyeball the output from the
above command and find the sum for each of the 24 classes.
* Then you can write some code that creates a new variable with the sum for
each class.
* Eg if the sum in class 11 is 41.35, the line would be "if class=11
sum04=41.35" .
* And if the sum in class 12 is 72.7838, the next line is "if class=12
sum04=72.7838" .
* et cetera through class 64.
* Below I've done that.
* Again, what would have been cells 21 and 31 are merged into class 30 because
cell 21 is empty for the Pilot.

if class=11 sum04=41.35.
if class=12 sum04=72.7838.
if class=13 sum04=94.7339.
if class=14 sum04=41.9903.
if class=22 sum04=60.7396.
if class=23 sum04=65.7730.
if class=24 sum04=70.0043.
if class=30 sum04=39.1824.
if class=32 sum04=84.9508.
if class=33 sum04=68.3808.
if class=34 sum04=72.1604.
if class=41 sum04=23.3144.
if class=42 sum04=61.1572.
if class=43 sum04=59.9263.
if class=44 sum04=68.1868.
if class=51 sum04=26.2624.
if class=52 sum04=47.1972.
if class=53 sum04=30.0821.
if class=54 sum04=31.0042.
if class=61 sum04=44.9710.
if class=62 sum04=54.2397.
if class=63 sum04=26.6200.
if class=64 sum04=26.9913.


* Step 2B.
* Sum the 2004 weights for 2006 Rs in each cell.
*this process is like Step 2A, but using the 2006 data.

compute pilot = 0.
if status=1 pilot=1.
sort cases by class.
split file layered by class.
```

```
temporary.
select if pilot=1.
freq v040101 /format=notable /statistics=sum.
split file off.
* NOTE: the way I've written this, again, you have to eyeball the output from
the above commands and write down the sum for each of the classes.
* Once again, class 30 is the merger of what would be 21 and 31 due to the
empty 21 cell in the Pilot .

if class=11 sum06=5.6768.
if class=12 sum06=22.3486.
if class=13 sum06=49.8550.
if class=14 sum06=19.5304.
if class=22 sum06=21.4898.
if class=23 sum06=28.2506.
if class=24 sum06=38.0849.
if class=30 sum06=5.9892.
if class=32 sum06=50.2837.
if class=33 sum06=45.1373.
if class=34 sum06=57.7775.
if class=41 sum06=11.4415.
if class=42 sum06=27.5127.
if class=43 sum06=43.1141.
if class=44 sum06=48.2008.
if class=51 sum06=14.0188.
if class=52 sum06=26.0782.
if class=53 sum06=19.2623.
if class=54 sum06=25.5683.
if class=61 sum06=10.7418.
if class=62 sum06=30.6563.
if class=63 sum06=14.5124.
if class=64 sum06=21.7882.

if status ne 1 sum06=0.
missing values sum06 (0).


* Step 2C.
* Compute a weight adjustment factor defined as the ratio of A divided by B.

compute adjfac = sum04/sum06.


* Step 2D.
* Compute the 2006 adjusted weight for each R as the adjustment factor times
the 2004 weight.


compute wgt06 = v040101*adjfac.
if pilot ne 1 wgt06 = 0.
missing values wgt06 (0).


* Step 2E.
* Check that the sum of the adjusted weights for the Rs equals the sum of
  the 2004 weights for all 1212 sample members.

* The sums from the two variables below should be the same.
* A slight difference could result from rounding error in steps 2A and 2B.
freq v040101 /format notable /statistics=sum.
freq wgt06 /format notable /statistics=sum.
```