Version 01 Codebook

CODEBOOK INTRODUCTION FILE
1988 SUPERTUESDAY STUDY
(1988.S)

USER NOTE:
This file has been converted to electronic format via OCR scanning.
As as result, the user is advised that some errors in character
recognition may have resulted within the text.

AMERICAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES

1988 PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION PROCESS STUDY

(1988 'SUPER TUESDAY' STUDY)

CODEBOOK

ICPSR ARCHIVE NUMBER 9093

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Note: >>sections in the codebook introduction and

```
              codebook appendix can be navigated in the
              machine-readable files by searching ">>".
```

INTRODUCTORY MATERIAL   (file intstues.cbk)

>> SUPER-TUESDAY GENERAL INFORMATION
>> SUPER-TUESDAY STUDY DESCRIPTION
>> SUPER-TUESDAY SAMPLING AND FIELD ADMINISTRATION
>> CODEBOOK INFORMATION

CODEBOOK

APPENDICES   (file appstues.cbk)

>> SUPER-TUESDAY BENCHMARK FREQUENCIES
>> SUPER-TUESDAY MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM CODE
 >> SUPER TUESDAY GENERAL INFORMATION

    The NES/CPS 1988 "Super Tuesday Study" was conducted by the
    Center for Political Studies of the Institute for Social
    Research, under the general direction of Warren E. Miller. Santa
    Traugott is the Director of Studies. Zoanne Blackburn managed
    the study for the Survey Research Center's Telephone Facility.
    Giovanna Morchio of the NES project staff prepared the data for
    release. The study was funded by National Science Foundation
    grant #SES-8341310, providing long term support for the National
    Election Studies. Since 1978, these studies have been designed
    by a National Board of Overseers, the members of which meet
    several times a year to plan content and administration of the
    major study components.

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

    The study was planned by a committee consisting of
    Professors Feldman, (Chair); Goldenberg, Brody and Rivers, from
    the Board of Overseers, and Henry Brady, University of Chicago;
    Larry Bartels, University of Rochester; Steven J. Rosenstone and
    Donald R. Kinder, University of Michigan.

>> The Super-Tuesday Study Description

The NES 1988 Study of the Presidential Nomination Process
(the Super-Tuesday study) was conducted in two waves. The pre-
election wave of the study was in the field between January 17
and 6:00 p.m. on March 8, 1988. A total of 2076 interviews were
distributed over the seven weeks; a larger number of interviews
were taken in the week between the Iowa caucus and New Hampshire
primary, and during the week preceding Super-Tuesday itself. The
response rate was 59.3%. (The file actually contains 2117
records; 41 "minimum partials" are included. These are cases
where the respondents broke off the interview for good before the
G section. While these cases are included in the dataset, they
are not included in the calculation of the response rate. Nine of
these respondents gave us a post-election interview. All of the
41 respondents can be deleted from analysis by use of variable 5,
the Result Code.)

The Pre-election questionnaire, administered by telephone,
was 40 minutes long. Questions included candidate recognition
and evaluations; feeling thermometers and traits; assessment of
each candidate's chances of winning their party's nomination and
the November general election; attitudes on public issues; vote
intention; vote choice; approval voting; age; race; education;
occupation; labor union membership; income; and religious
affiliation. There were four forms of the pre-election
questionnaire; the form determined the order in which the
candidate names were read to respondents, in the recognition and
feeling thermometer series, traits, chances for nomination and
election, and liberal-conservative placements. See Table 1,
Questionnaire Forms.

Among the questions on the survey was one that asked for the
names of newspapers that the respondent read for information
about politics. This item is intended to aid those who wish to
match the content of newspaper coverage of the campaign with the
respondent's views on candidates and issues. In the present
dataset, information is available only about those newspapers
read by 10 or more respondents (about 50% of the Super-Tuesday
respondents). However, data on newspapers read by fewer
respondents and presumably with smaller circulation is available
from the National Election Studies, following standard request
procedures for the release of confidential information. Please
contact NES Project staff for details of this procedure.

Brief reinterviews were conducted with 1688 respondents in
the two and a half weeks immediately after Super-Tuesday. Two-
thirds of the recontact interviews were taken in the week after
after Super-Tuesday. The response rate was 79.4%. Recognition
and feeling thermometers on all candidates, as well as traits on
selected candidates, were asked. A full range of voting
questions was included; whether R voted; in which primary and
for whom; who R prefers to see each party nominate for President,
who R would most like to see elected as President, and, if R
could have cast more than one vote, for whom would he/she have
voted.

>> SUPER-TUESDAY SAMPLING AND FIELD ADMINISTRATION

The NES 1988 Study of Presidential nominations is based on a
two-stage random digit dialing (RDD) sample of telephone
households in sixteen states which held a presidential primary
election on "Super-Tuesday," March 8, 1988. This is a sample of
the states which held a primary on March 8th, but it is important
to note that each state is not self-representing, i.e., this is
not a collection of separate state samples.

The RDD methodology used in this study was unique in that
all primary and secondary screening of telephone households took
place prior to the start of the actual survey field period.
(Typically, the second stage of screening takes place
concurrently with the interviewing process.) The study was
designed so that a specified number of interviews were to be
taken per week, through the seven weeks leading up to Super
Tuesday. Past experience has shown that the conventional method
of integrating the second stage RDD screening with the interview
of a time allocated sample produces considerable "down time"
toward the end of the time interval, as sample is tied up without
clear dispositions.

Following standard RDD procedure, a sample of 2,132 Area
Code/CO combinations was selected from 12,867 possible
AreaCode/CO combinations for the sixteen states which have
primaries on "Super Tuesday." SRC's January AT&T stratified file
was used as the sampling frame. The overall sampling rate for
Area Code/CO combinations was 1/6.035. To form the sample
primary numbers, random 4-digit suffixes were attached to each of
the 2,132 selected Area/CO codes. Each of the a=2132 sample
primary numbers was screened to determine its status as a working
household telephone number. If the primary number was a working
household telephone number, its "one hundred series" was retained
for further sampling. Table 2 shows the number of AreaCode/CO
combinations selected and the number of "working primaries" for
each of the sixteen states.

Table 3 outlines the design specifications and assumptions
for the complete 1988 NES Study of Presidential Nominations, and
the number of interviews actually completed. Based on the sample
design assumptions outlined in Table 3, an RDD second stage
sample of n=3412 household numbers was determined to be needed to
meet the completed interview targets for the study. However, in
order to provide the flexibility needed to adjust the sample size
for small departures from the design response and eligibility
rate assumptions, a reserve of n=400 additional working household
numbers was also identified in the second stage prescreening
phase of the study. Use of this reserve was in fact required
during the study. To achieve a prescreened sample of n=3400 + 400
working household numbers, the second stage cluster size for each
of the working primary stage clusters was set to equal 7.677
working household numbers.

The prescreening of the RDD second stage sample was
conducted during the period November 1987-January 1988. The

brief screening interview ascertained not only the household
status of the RDD second stage sample number but also identified
whether one or more eligible voters resided in the selected
households. Late in the study period, an additional sample of
248 numbers, was drawn from the original 495 clusters, bringing
the total sample up to 2048 numbers (and increasing the cluster
size to 8.177). No prescreening was done on these 248 numbers.
The additional sample was necessary because between the
prescreening and actual start of the field period, about 350
numbers became nonworking or other nonsample.

During the prescreening of the RDD second stage sample, some
small fraction of the phone contacts refused to provide
information needed to determine the household status of the
sample number and or household members/ voter eligibility. Other
screening contacts may identify language problems or
circumstances which would prevent the household residents from
providing an interview. For the most part, these prescreen
refusals and noninterviews were passed forward and contacted
again during the production phase of the study. If not, there
were treated as study refusals, rather than nonsample.

Our overall evaluation of this procedure is not complete.
There is some reason to believe that it was a costlier procedure
than completing screening during the field period, and moreover,
that it had some negative impact on response rate.

The research design for the Super Tuesday study required a
specific time allocation of the study sample across the seven
week period preceding the Super Tuesday Election. Table 4
identifies the target dates of the one-week reference periods and
the completed interview targets and the number actually taken.
Actual release of the sample was distributed over the days of the
week in such a way as to ensure a continuous and productive flow
of both new and old work through the SRC Telephone Facility. The
replicate number and the day the replicate was released are both
variables in the datafile.

Once released, sample cases were immediately eligible for
contact, respondent selection and interview. A case was
permitted to remain in the "active" sample until an interivew
disposition was obtained or until 14 days had elapsed. At the
end of 14 days, cases were reviewed and those which seemed to
hold out any real promise of an interview were retained as active
sample, from day to day. In general, few cases were promising
after 14 days, and if there was no interview, the case was coded
either refusal or non-interview (possible nonsample) and removed
from the active pool of sample numbers. To facilitate the day by
day release of new sample listings, the entire sample of n=3800
was divided into replicates or subsamples of approximately 25
numbers. Each replicate was a small probability subsample.
Differences in the number of interviews desired per week were
handled by adjustments in the number of replicates per day which
were issued.

The sample release process took into account the both the
start up effect that occurs in week one -- that is, there was no
carryover of sample from the previous week -- and the
carryforward for old numbers into the last week's sample size.

The Pre-election study used Computer Assisted Telephone
Interviewing -- i.e., CATI. It is very difficult to follow the
flow of this questionnaire using only a hard copy of the computer
screens which the interviewers saw as they were interviewing.
Consequently, the project staff has prepared a "Questionnaire"
for the pre-election wavewhich accompanies this documentation,
which should be viewed as a "flow chart" of the interview.
Question numbers on the questionnaire will match, with very minor
exceptions, the question numbers in the codebook documentation.

The Post-election wave was a standard paper and pencil
questionnaire. In the interests of reaching respondents very
quickly after Super Tuesday, half of the interviews (roughly)
were done using the SRC Telephone Facility in Ann Arbor, and the
other half were done, also by phone, by SRC's Field Staff of
interviewers from their homes in different parts of the country.

TABLE 1: SUPER-TUESDAY CANDIDATE ORDER BY FORM OF QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM 1	FORM 2	FORM 3	FORM 4
Gore	Simon	Bush	DuPont
Dukakis	Gephardt	Haig	Kemp
Hart	Jackson	Robertson	Dole
Babbitt	Babbitt	Dole	Robertson
Jackson	Hart	Kemp	Haig
Gephardt	Dukakis	DuPont	Bush
Simon	Gore	Gore	Simon
Bush	DuPont	Dukakis	Gephardt
Haig	Kemp	Hart	Jackson
Robertson	Dole	Babbitt	Babbitt
Dole	Robertson	Jackson	Hart
Kemp	Haig	Gephardt	Dukakis
Dupont	Bush	Simon	Gore

Questions C1-C3, E1-E4, Gl-G14, and J1, were administered
using form variations as above. In contrast, there is only
one version of the recontact questionnaire.

Please note also that as candidates dropped out of the race,
they were dropped from questions E1-E4, G1-G14, and J1,
although the C1-C3 series continued to be asked.

TABLE 2: Distribution of Primary Numbers by State

State	No. Selected	No. Working	% Working
Alabama	90	23	25.6
Arkansas	81	13	16.0
Florida	225	70	31.1
Georgia	131	33	25.2
Kentucky	93	16	17.2
Louisiana	98	26	26.5
Maryland	95	30	31.6
Massachusetts	112	35	31.2
Mississippi	61	11	18.0
Missouri	174	27	15.5
North Carolina	136	36	26.5
Oklahoma	121	21	17.4
Rhode Island	20	5	25.0
Tennessee	106	24	22.6

```
        Texas                      450             94                      20.9
        Virginia                   139             31                      22.3
        Total                     2132            495                      23.2
```

Table 3: Sample Design Specifications and Assumptions

```
                                          TARGET          ACTUAL
        Completed Interviews               2052            2076
                Response Rate               .62             .59
            Eligible Tele. HHs             3309            3504
               Eligibility Rate             .97             .97
        Sample Telephone HHs               3412            3628
        _____

        Reserve Sample Tele.HHs             400             648

        Total RDD Sample of HH #s          3812            4048
```

Table 4: Sample Allocation to Study Weeks and Completed Interviews

```
            WEEK        DATES TARGET      ACTUAL
             1       01/17-01/23 228       212
             2       01/24-01/30 228       227
             3       01/31-02/08 228       304
             4       02/09-02/16 402       403
             5       02/17-02/23 322       274
             6       02/24-03/01 322       265
             7       02/28-03/08 322       391

                        TOTAL 2052       2076
```

 >> CODEBOOK INFORMATION

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

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

Line

```
1   ==============================
2   VAR 480026      NAME-R NOT VT-WAS R REG TO VT
3               COLUMNS 61   - 61
4               NUMERIC
5               MD=0 OR GE 8
6
7                   Q. 17.  (IF R DID NOT VOTE)  WERE YOU REGISTERED (ELIGIBLE)
8               TO VOTE.
9               .........................................................
10
11          82      1.  YES
```

```
12          149      2.  NO
13
14            0      8.  DK
15            9      9.  NA
16          422      0.  INAP., R VOTED
```

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

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

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

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

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

Line 7 - Actual question text for survey variables or a description of
         non-survey variables (for example, congressional district).
         Survey items usually include the question number (for example
         "B1a.") from the Study questionnaire; beginning in 1996
         non-survey items also have unique item numbers (for example
         "CSheet.1").

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

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

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

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