

Version 01 Codebook

-----

CODEBOOK INTRODUCTION FILE  
1988 PRE-POST STUDY  
(1988.TV)

AMERICAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES  
1988 PRE-POST STUDY

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

WARREN E. MILLER  
AND THE NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES

CENTER FOR POLITICAL STUDIES  
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

NES ARCHIVE NUMBER 9196

BIBLIOGRAPHIC CITATION, ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF ASSISTANCE  
AND DATA DISCLAIMER

ALL MANUSCRIPTS UTILIZING DATA MADE AVAILABLE THROUGH THE CONSORTIUM SHOULD ACKNOWLEDGE THAT FACT AS WELL AS IDENTIFY THE ORIGINAL COLLECTOR OF THE DATA. IN ORDER TO GET SUCH SOURCE ACKNOWLEDGMENT LISTED IN SOCIAL SCIENCE BIBLIOGRAPHIC UTILITIES, IT IS NECESSARY TO PRESENT THEM IN THE FORM OF A FOOTNOTE OR A REFERENCE. THE BIBLIOGRAPHIC CITATION FOR THIS DATA COLLECTION IS:

MILLER, WARREN E., AND THE NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES. AMERICAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY, 1988: PRE- AND POST-ELECTION SURVEY COMPUTER FILE. ANN ARBOR, MI: CENTER FOR POLITICAL STUDIES, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, 1989 ORIGINAL PRODUCER. ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN: INTER-UNIVERSITY CONSORTIUM FOR POLITICAL AND SOCIAL RESEARCH, 1989 PRODUCER AND DISTRIBUTOR.

THE ICPSR COUNCIL URGES ALL USERS OF THE ICPSR DATA FACILITIES TO FOLLOW SOME ADAPTATION OF THIS STATEMENT WITH THE PARENTHESES INDICATING ITEMS TO BE FILLED IN APPROPRIATELY OR DELETED BY THE INDIVIDUAL USER.

THE DATA (AND TABULATIONS) UTILIZED IN THIS (PUBLICATION) WERE MADE AVAILABLE (IN PART) BY THE INTER-UNIVERSITY CONSORTIUM FOR POLITICAL AND SOCIAL RESEARCH. THE DATA FOR AMERICAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY, 1988: PRE- AND POST-ELECTION SURVEY WERE ORIGINALLY COLLECTED BY WARREN E. MILLER AND THE NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES. NEITHER THE COLLECTOR OF THE ORIGINAL DATA NOR THE CONSORTIUM BEARS ANY RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE ANALYSES OR INTERPRETATIONS PRESENTED HERE.

IN ORDER TO PROVIDE FUNDING AGENCIES WITH ESSENTIAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE USE OF ARCHIVAL RESOURCES AND TO FACILITATE THE EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION ABOUT ICPSR PARTICIPANTS' RESEARCH ACTIVITIES, EACH USER OF THE ICPSR DATA FACILITIES IS EXPECTED TO SEND TWO COPIES OF EACH COMPLETED MANUSCRIPT OR THESIS ABSTRACT TO THE CONSORTIUM. PLEASE INDICATE IN THE COVER LETTER WHICH DATA WERE USED.

□

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Note: >> sections in the codebook introduction and codebook appendix can be navigated in the machine-readable files by searching ">>".

## INTRODUCTIORY MATERIALS (file int1988.cbk)

-----  
 >> 1988 STUDY DESCRIPTION INTRODUCTION  
 >> 1988 SURVEY CONTENT AND ADMINISTRATION  
 >> 1988 SAMPLING INFORMATION  
 >> 1988 VOTE VALIDATION STUDY  
 >> 1988 ELECTION ADMINISTRATION SURVEY  
 >> 1988 STAFF AND TECHNICAL PAPERS  
 >> 1987 NES PILOT STUDY REPORTS  
 >> DESCRIPTION OF REVALIDATION OF 1988 VOTE (1991)  
 >> 1988 CODEBOOK INFORMATION  
 >> 1988 ICPSR PROCESSING INFORMATION  
 >> 1988 VARIABLE DESCRIPTION LIST

## CODEBOOK

-----  
 1988 variables

## APPENDICES (file app1988.cbk)

-----  
 >> 1980 CENSUS DEFINITIONS  
 >> 1988 PARTY/CANDIDATE MASTER CODE  
 >> 1988 CANDIDATE NUMBER MASTER CODE  
 >> 1988 IMPORTANT PROBLEMS CODE  
 >> 1988 OCCUPATION RECODES  
 >> 1980 CENSUS OCCUPATION CODE  
 >> 1980 CENSUS INDUSTRY CODE  
 >> 1988 ICPSR NATIONALITY AND ETHNIC CODE  
 >> 1988 ICPSR STATE AND COUNTRY CODE  
 >> CITIES WITH POPULATION OF 25,000 OR MORE, 1988 Study  
 >> 1998 STATE PRIMARY BALLOT CARDS  
 >> 1988 CAMPAIGN ISSUES MASTER CODE  
 >> 1988 PARTY DIFFERENCES CODE  
 >> 1988 LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE MASTER CODE

□

>> 1988 STUDY DESCRIPTION INTRODUCTION

THE NES/CPS AMERICAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY 1988 WAS CONDUCTED BY THE CENTER FOR POLITICAL STUDIES OF THE INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH, UNDER THE GENERAL DIRECTION OF WARREN E. MILLER. SANTA TRAUOGOTT IS THE DIRECTOR OF STUDIES. HEATHER HEWITT MANAGED THE STUDY FOR THE SURVEY RESEARCH CENTER'S FIELD OFFICE. GIOVANNA MORCHIO OF THE NES PROJECT STAFF PREPARED THE DATA FOR RELEASE. THIS IS THE TWENTIETH IN A SERIES OF STUDIES OF AMERICAN NATIONAL

ELECTIONS PRODUCED BY THE POLITICAL BEHAVIOR PROGRAM OF THE SURVEY RESEARCH CENTER AND THE CENTER FOR POLITICAL STUDIES, AND IT IS THE SIXTH SUCH STUDY TO BE CONDUCTED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION GRANTS (SOC77-08885 AND SES-8341310) PROVIDING LONG-TERM SUPPORT FOR THE NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES. SINCE 1978 THE NES ELECTION STUDIES HAVE BEEN DESIGNED BY A NATIONAL BOARD OF OVERSEERS, THE MEMBERS OF WHICH MEET SEVERAL TIMES A YEAR TO PLAN CONTENT AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE MAJOR STUDY COMPONENTS.

BOARD MEMBERS DURING THE PLANNING OF THE 1988 NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY INCLUDED: MORRIS P. FIORINA, HARVARD UNIVERSITY, CHAIR; RICHARD A. BRODY, STANFORD UNIVERSITY; STANLEY FELDMAN, UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY; EDIE N. GOLDENBERG, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN; GARY C. JACOBSON, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO; STANLEY KELLEY, JR., PRINCETON UNIVERSITY; DONALD R. KINDER, THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN; THOMAS MANN, THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION; DOUGLAS RIVERS, THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES; RAY WOLFINGER, THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY; WARREN E. MILLER, ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY, EX OFFICIO; AND STEVEN J. ROSENSTONE, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, EX OFFICIO. AS PART OF THE PLANNING PROCESS, A SPECIAL PLANNING COMMITTEE WAS APPOINTED, A PILOT STUDY CONDUCTED, AND STIMULUS LETTERS SENT TO THE MEMBERS OF THE SCHOLARLY COMMUNITY SOLICITING INPUT ON STUDY PLANS. THE 1988 STUDY PLANNING COMMITTEE INCLUDED SEVERAL BOARD MEMBERS (KINDER, CO-CHAIR; KELLEY; MILLER, EX OFFICIO; AND ROSENSTONE, EX-OFFICIO AND CO-CHAIR) AND TWO OTHER SCHOLARS (KATHLEEN KNIGHT, UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON, AND JOHN ZALLER, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES.

THE PLANNING COMMITTEE BEGAN MEETING IN FEBRUARY OF 1987. A TWO-WAVE PILOT STUDY WAS CARRIED OUT IN MAY AND JUNE OF 1987 FOR THE PURPOSE OF DEVELOPING NEW INSTRUMENTATION FOR THE 1988 ELECTION STUDY. THE PILOT STUDY RESPONDENTS WERE A SUBSAMPLE OF 1986 ELECTION STUDY RESPONDENTS, AND THE 1986 DATA FOR THESE RESPONDENTS IS PART OF THE RELEASED DATASET. NEW ITEMS WERE TESTED IN THE AREA OF MORALITY, FOREIGN POLICY ATTITUDES, SYSTEM SUPPORT AND POLITICAL EFFICACY.

A SIGNIFICANT PORTION OF THE STUDY WAS DEVOTED TO EXPERIMENTS DESIGNED TO FURTHER UNDERSTANDING OF THE SURVEY RESPONSE. DATA FROM THE PILOT STUDY ARE AVAILABLE THROUGH THE INTER-UNIVERSITY CONSORTIUM FOR POLITICAL AND SOCIAL RESEARCH (ICPSR 8713). RESULTS FROM THE PILOT STUDY WERE USED BY THE PLANNING COMMITTEE IN FORMULATING RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD ABOUT STUDY CONTENT FOR THE 1988 ELECTION STUDY.

THE 1988 NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY HAD TWO OTHER MAJOR COMPONENTS. THIS DOCUMENT DESCRIBES THE TRADITIONAL PRE- AND POST-PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION SURVEY PANEL. THE OTHER MAJOR COMPONENTS WERE: A STUDY OF THE PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATING PROCESS, FOCUSED ON THE MARCH 8 (SUPER-TUESDAY) PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY ELECTION; AND A STUDY OF SENATE ELECTIONS, CONDUCTED SIMULTANEOUSLY WITH THE POST-ELECTION SURVEY. THE SENATE ELECTIONS STUDY WAS CONDUCTED BY TELEPHONE. THE SUPER-TUESDAY STUDY IS CURRENTLY AVAILABLE THROUGH THE ICPSR (9093); THE SENATE STUDY IS AVAILABLE AS ICPSR 9219.

□

&gt;&gt; 1988 SURVEY CONTENT AND ADMINISTRATION

SURVEY CONTENT.

THE BOARD OF OVERSEERS BALANCED A NUMBER OF CONSIDERATIONS IN SELECTING CONTENT FOR THE PRE- AND POST-PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION SURVEY PANEL. THERE WAS, AS ALWAYS, THE NECESSITY OF MAINTAINING CONTINUITY WITH PAST SURVEYS, SO THAT MEASURES THAT HAVE REACHED THE TIME-SERIES OR "CORE" STATUS COULD BE MAINTAINED. ALL "CORE" ITEMS WERE EVALUATED BY THE BOARD, AND INPUT WAS SOLICITED FROM THE USER COMMUNITY ABOUT WHETHER EACH SHOULD BE RETAINED.

THE CORE ITEMS FOR THE PRE-ELECTION STUDY INCLUDE: CAMPAIGN ATTENTION; LIKES AND DISLIKES OF THE PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES; MEDIA ATTENTIVENESS; REAGAN APPROVAL; FEELING THERMOMETER RATINGS OF CANDIDATES AND PARTIES; RETROSPECTIVE ECONOMIC EVALUATIONS (NATIONAL AND INDIVIDUAL); TRAITS AND AFFECTS FOR BUSH, DUKAKIS AND JACKSON; LIBERAL-CONSERVATIVE SCALE (WITH PROXIMITIES); PARTY IDENTIFICATION, 7-POINT ISSUE SCALES WITH PLACEMENTS; FEDERAL BUDGET PREFERENCES; VIEWS ON ABORTION; VOTE INTENTION; AND THE STANDARD AND EXTENSIVE BATTERY OF DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS.

POST-ELECTION STUDY CORE ITEMS ARE: CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATE LIKES AND DISLIKES; THERMOMETER RATINGS OF CANDIDATES AND GROUPS; RECALL; CONTACT WITH CONGRESSPERSON OR CANDIDATE; VOTE; MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM; CAMPAIGN ACTIVITIES; SYSTEM SUPPORT AND EFFICACY ITEMS; QUESTIONS ABOUT RACIAL ATTITUDES; BATTERIES OF LIKERT TYPE (AGREE-DISAGREE) MEASURES OF VALUES AND PREDISPOSITIONS; AND A GROUP CLOSENESS QUESTION.

A NUMBER OF QUESTIONS ARE NEW OR RELATIVELY NEW TO THE PRE- AND POST-ELECTION SURVEYS. SOME CAME FROM THE PILOTING WORK DESCRIBED ABOVE, OTHERS WERE REINSTATED AT THE URGING OF THE NES SCHOLARLY COMMUNITY, AND OTHERS WERE DESIGNED TO REFLECT TOPICAL CONCERNS OF THE CAMPAIGN. ITEMS IN THIS NEW CONTENT CATEGORY IN THE PRE-ELECTION STUDY ARE: EVALUATIONS OF THE PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY CANDIDATES; THE RESPONDENT'S PRIMARY VOTE; HOW SERIOUSLY THE RESPONDENT EVALUATES THE BUDGET DEFICIT AND WHETHER H/SHE WOULD PAY MORE IN TAXES; A SEVEN-POINT SCALE ON HEALTH INSURANCE; FOREIGN POLICY ATTITUDE ITEMS; A REINSTATED ITEM ON EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN; A QUESTION ON SERIOUSNESS OF THE DRUG PROBLEM IN THE UNITED STATES; AND A SECTION DEALING WITH EVALUATIONS OF THE REAGAN PRESIDENCY.

THE POST-ELECTION "NEW CONTENT" INCLUDES: EVALUATIONS OF THE REAGAN PRESIDENCY (SEE SURVEY ADMINISTRATION); RECALL OF THE 1984 PRESIDENTIAL VOTE; PARENTAL PARTY IDENTIFICATION; EVALUATION OF BUSH AND DUKAKIS ON THE ISSUES

OF ENVIRONMENT AND CRIME; A QUESTION ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY; AND NEW SYSTEM SUPPORT AND POLITICAL EFFICACY ITEMS.

#### SURVEY ADMINISTRATION.

TWO BASIC DESIGN PARAMETERS WERE SET BY THE BOARD THAT RELATE TO SURVEY ADMINISTRATION: 1) IN THE PRE-ELECTION WAVE, THE SURVEY WAS TO BE ADMINISTERED IN TWO-WEEK "QUARTERS." 2) BOTH SURVEYS WERE TO BE ADMINISTERED IN TWO FORMS, SO THAT A MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF CONTENT COULD BE INCLUDED. BOTH OF THESE PARAMETERS ARE EXPLAINED BELOW.

#### INTERVIEW TARGET PERIODS.

IF ONE THINKS THAT THERE IS SOME AMOUNT OF VOTE DECISION-MAKING THAT IS RELATIVELY LATE, THEN ONE WOULD LIKE TO HAVE A MEASURE THAT IS NOT CONTAMINATED BY DIFFICULTY OF OBTAINING INTERVIEW, FOR VOTE-DECISION BY TIME-OF-INTERVIEW. THAT IS, IF THE ENTIRE SAMPLE IS RELEASED IMMEDIATELY AND THE MOST RELUCTANT AND HARD-TO-REACH RESPONDENTS ARE SYSTEMATICALLY INTERVIEWED LATER IN THE INTERVIEW PERIOD THAN ARE MORE AMENABLE RESPONDENTS, AND IF THE HARDER-TO-REACH RESPONDENTS ALSO DECIDE LATER (OR DIFFERENTLY) THAN OTHER RESPONDENTS, THEN THE VOTE-DECISION BY TIME-OF-INTERVIEW RELATIONSHIP IS CONFOUNDED.

THIS LOGIC LED THE BOARD TO DECIDE THAT THE SAMPLE SHOULD BE ADMINISTERED IN FOUR TWO-WEEK QUARTERS. THE FIELD PERIOD BEGAN ON TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 6. THE FIRST QUARTER ENDED MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 19TH. THE SECOND QUARTER WAS SEPTEMBER 20TH-OCTOBER 3RD; THE 3RD QUARTER WAS OCTOBER 4TH-OCTOBER 17TH; AND THE LAST QUARTER WAS OCTOBER 17TH-OCTOBER 31. NOVEMBER 1-NOVEMBER 7 WAS LEFT FOR "CATCH-UP" INTERVIEWS. IT IS IMPORTANT TO NOTE THAT INTERVIEWS WITH SELECTED RESPONDENTS THAT COULD NOT BE TAKEN IN THE SAMPLE QUARTER ASSIGNED TO THEM WERE NONETHELESS TAKEN, USUALLY LATER IN THE STUDY PERIOD. 80% OF ALL INTERVIEWS WERE TAKEN WITHIN THE TARGET PERIOD. VARIABLE V880039 RECORDS INFORMATION ABOUT TARGET PERIOD ASSIGNMENT AND SUCCESS. ONE QUARTER OF EACH SEGMENT (SEE SAMPLING INFORMATION) AS ASSIGNED TO EACH TWO-WEEK TARGET PERIOD.

#### FORMS.

TWO FORMS WERE USED IN BOTH PRE- AND POST-ELECTION SURVEYS, CONTAINING SOME QUESTION-WORDING EXPERIMENTS AND SOME QUESTION-ORDERING EXPERIMENTS. (SEE TABLE 1A AT THE END OF THIS SECTION FOR A MAPPING OF QUESTIONS BY FORM.) FOR THE PRE-ELECTION STUDY, HALF THE SAMPLE WAS ASSIGNED TO FORM A, AND THE OTHER HALF TO FORM B. FORM ASSIGNMENT WAS THE SAME IN THE POST AS IN THE PRE, ALTHOUGH A FEW POST-ELECTION RESPONDENTS WERE INADVERTENTLY ADMINISTERED THE WRONG FORM. THEY ARE TRACEABLE IN VARIABLE V880040.

IT IS CRITICAL TO NOTE THE INTERACTION OF THE REAGAN RETROSPECTIVE EVALUATION ITEMS WITH THE FORM ASSIGNMENT. THIS SECTION WAS PARTICULARLY LENGTHY. IN ORDER NOT TO MAKE EITHER THE PRE- OR THE POST-ELECTION INSTRUMENT UNACCEPTABLY LONG, AND ALSO TO STUDY THE EFFECTS OF POST-ELECTION MEDIA

ANALYSIS OF THE PRESIDENCY, THE REAGAN EVALUATION ITEMS WERE SPLIT BETWEEN THE TWO WAVES AND THE TWO FORMS AS FOLLOWS: FORM A RESPONDENTS WERE ADMINISTERED PART 1 OF THE REAGAN RETROSPECTIVE ITEMS IN THE PRE-ELECTION STUDY. THEY RECEIVED PART 2 OF THE REAGAN RETROSPECTIVE IN THE POST-ELECTION STUDY. FORM B RESPONDENTS WERE ADMINISTERED PART 2 OF THE REAGAN RETROSPECTIVE IN THE PRE-ELECTION WAVE, AND PART 1 IN THE POST-ELECTION SURVEY.

NOTE THAT PART 1 ITEMS WERE ADMINISTERED TO HALF THE RESPONDENTS IN THE PRE-ELECTION SURVEY AND TO THE OTHER HALF OF THE RESPONDENTS IN THE POST-ELECTION SURVEY, AND SIMILARLY FOR PART 2 ITEMS. THE STUDY STAFF HAS BUILT, AND ICPSR HAS RETAINED, MEASURES COMBINING PRE- AND POST-ELECTION ADMINISTRATIONS OF EACH REAGAN RETROSPECTIVE VARIABLE. THESE COMBINED VARIABLES APPEAR IN THE POST-ELECTION SECTION OF THE DATASET, VARIABLES V880898-V880923 AND 881002-881043. (PLEASE SEE TABLE 1A BELOW FOR CLARIFICATION.) THE CODEBOOK DOCUMENTS THESE SITUATIONS WITH AN A OR B AND PRE- OR POST- NOTATION IN THE VARIABLE NAME. THE ORIGINAL PRE-ELECTION VARIABLES HAVE BEEN DELETED FOR THE ICPSR RELEASE DATASET.

THE OTHER MAJOR USAGE OF THE TWO FORMS WAS TO CONDUCT AN EXPERIMENT IN SURVEY RESPONSE. STANDARD LIKERT BATTERIES ON VALUES (I.E., EGALITARIANISM, RACISM) WERE ADMINISTERED AS USUAL, TOGETHER AS ONE BATTERY, IN FORM A OF THE POST-ELECTION SURVEY. IN FORM B, THESE ITEMS WERE SPLIT UP AND SCRAMBLED. THE PURPOSE OF THE EXPERIMENT IS TO DETERMINE WHETHER SCALE OR INDEX RELIABILITIES RESULT FROM INHERENT ITEM CONSISTENCIES, OR BECAUSE OF RESPONSE SET

DEVELOPED BY RESPONDENTS, AS THEY GO THROUGH A SIMILAR SET OF ITEMS. THE VERSION OF THESE ITEMS THAT APPEARS IN THE ICPSR RELEASE OF THE DATA ARE COMBINED FROM BOTH FORMS; USERS SHOULD BE AWARE, HOWEVER, OF THE DIFFERENCES IN ADMINISTRATION BETWEEN FORMS FOR THESE ITEMS. BOTH THE DATA MAP AND CODEBOOK FLAG THESE VARIABLES WITH (A & B) NOTATION.

SEVERAL OTHER POINTS ABOUT THE SURVEY ADMINISTRATION NEED FURTHER ELABORATION:

1) AS USUAL, THERE WERE A FEW ERRONEOUSLY SELECTED RESPONDENTS. IN THE TWO OF THE THREE INSTANCES LISTED BELOW, THE REASON FOR THE INCORRECT SELECTION WAS IMPROPER NUMBERING OF THE KISH SELECTION TABLE (SEE SAMPLING INFORMATION) BY THE INTERVIEWER. THE WRONGLY SELECTED RESPONDENTS WERE NOT SELECTED ON THE BASIS OF WHO WAS MOST AVAILABLE. NEVERTHELESS, FOR THOSE ANALYSTS WHO WISH TO DELETE THESE CASES, THEIR PRE-ELECTION CASE ID#S ARE: 00253, 00316, 00362.

2) IN THE POST-ELECTION SURVEY, RESPONDENTS ARE ASKED LENGTHY SERIES OF QUESTIONS ABOUT THEIR PARTICULAR CONGRESSPERSONS AND SENATORS. INTERVIEWERS MUST PRE-EDIT QUESTIONNAIRES TO FILL IN THE NAMES APPROPRIATE FOR THE STATE AND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT IN WHICH THE RESPONDENT IS LIVING (OR WAS LIVING DURING THE PRE-ELECTION INTERVIEW). INTERVIEWERS ARE SENT "CANDIDATE LISTS" FOR EACH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT IN THE SAMPLE SEGMENTS IN WHICH THEY

ARE INTERVIEWING. EACH CANDIDATE AND SENATOR ON THAT LIST IS ASSIGNED A PARTICULAR NUMBER THAT REFLECTS HIS OR HER INCUMBENCY STATUS AND PARTY. (SEE CANDIDATE NUMBER MASTER CODES) PARTICULAR QUESTIONS IN THE SURVEY REQUIRE THE INSERTION BY THE INTERVIEWER DURING PRE-EDITING OF THE NAMES OF CANDIDATES WITH SPECIFIC NUMBERS. SEE, FOR EXAMPLE, Q. B1, THE FEELING THERMOMETER. THE CANDIDATE LISTS USED BY THE INTERVIEWERS, WHICH SHOW WHICH CANDIDATES ARE ASSOCIATED WITH WHICH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT AND WITH WHICH NUMBERS THEY ARE TAGGED, CAN BE FOUND IN THE APPENDICES, NOTE 3 OF THIS DOCUMENTATION.

#### OCCUPATION CODING.

IN THE 1988 ELECTION STUDY, THE OCCUPATION CODING IS BASED ON THE 1980 CENSUS BUREAU THREE DIGIT OCCUPATION CODE. STARTING WITH THE 1986 ELECTION STUDY, WE HAVE RELEASED THESE VARIABLES IN SOMEWHAT LESS DETAIL THAN IN YEARS PAST. THE DATASET INCLUDES A TWO-DIGIT CODE WITH 71 CATEGORIES CORRESPONDING TO CENSUS BUREAU OCCUPATIONAL GROUPINGS. THOSE WHO HAVE NEED OF THE FULL OCCUPATION CODE FOR THEIR RESEARCH SHOULD CONTACT THE NES PROJECT STAFF FOR INFORMATION ABOUT THE CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH ACCESS TO THESE DATA MAY BE PROVIDED.

#### OTHER CONFIDENTIALITY RECODING.

FOR SOME YEARS, THE NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES HAVE NOT RELEASED INFORMATION FOR CENSUS TRACTS OR MINOR CIVIL DIVISIONS. THIS YEAR, INFORMATION ABOUT NEWSPAPERS READ BY FEWER THAN 10 PERSONS, AND/OR PUBLISHED IN RELATIVELY SMALL GEOGRAPHIC AREAS, HAS BEEN SUPPRESSED. PERMISSION TO USE THE MORE DETAILED GEOGRAPHIC OR NEWSPAPER INFORMATION FOR SCHOLARLY RESEARCH MAY BE OBTAINED FROM THE BOARD OF OVERSEERS. MORE INFORMATION ABOUT THIS IS AVAILABLE FROM NES PROJECT STAFF.

#### OPEN-ENDED MATERIALS.

TRADITIONALLY, THE ELECTION STUDIES HAVE CONTAINED SEVERAL MINUTES OF OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES (FOR EXAMPLE, THE PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES LIKES AND DISLIKES). THESE QUESTIONS ARE PUT INTO MASTER CODES BY THE SRC CODING SECTION. OTHER SCHOLARS HAVE DEVELOPED ALTERNATIVE OR SUPPLEMENTAL CODING SCHEMES FOR THE QUESTIONS (FOR EXAMPLE, THE LEVELS OF CONCEPTUALIZATION, RELEASED AS ICPSR #8151). THE BOARD OF OVERSEERS WISHES TO ENCOURAGE THESE EFFORTS BUT IN WAYS THAT RESPECT THE NES AND SRC OBLIGATION TO PROTECT THE PRIVACY AND ANONYMITY OF RESPONDENTS. CIRCUMSTANCES UNDER WHICH INDIVIDUALS MAY HAVE ACCESS TO TRANSCRIBED VERSIONS OF THESE QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN WORKED OUT AND THOSE INTERESTED SHOULD CONTACT THE NES PROJECT STAFF FOR FURTHER DETAILS.

#### TABLE 1A

#### QUESTION LAYOUT BY FORM



## PRE-ELECTION WAVE

QUESTION CONTENT	FORM A		FORM B	
	Q#	VAR#	Q#	VAR#
GOV. HELP BLACKS/OTHR MINORITIES 7-PT SCALE	L6A-H	880332- 880339	L7A-H	880340- 880347
REAGAN RETROSPECTIVE PART 1	P1-P13X	881002- 881043		NOT ASKED
REAGAN RETROSPECTIVE PART 2		NOT ASKED	Q1-Q5X	880898- 880923

## POST-ELECTION WAVE

QUESTION CONTENT	FORM A		FORM B	
	Q#	VAR#	Q#	VAR#
REAGAN RETROSPECTIVE PART 1		NOT ASKED	N1-N13B	881002- 881043 (INCLUDES DATA FROM PRE: P1-P13X)
REAGAN RETROSPECTIVE PART 2	K1-K5X	880898- 880923 (INCLUDES DATA FROM PRE: Q1-Q5X)		NOT ASKED
EQUALITARIANISM	L1A-F	880924- 880929	SCRAMBLED IN L & M	880924- 880929
POLITICAL EFFICACY	M1A-H	880936- 880944	SCRAMBLED IN L & M	880936- 880944
TRADITIONAL MORALITY	M4A-D	880951- 880954	SCRAMBLED IN L & M	880951- 880954
RACISM	M11A-E	880961- 880964	SCRAMBLED IN L & M	880961- 880964
NATIONALISM	M15A-C	880972- 880974	SCRAMBLED IN L & M	880972- 880974

TABLE 1B

## STUDY TOTALS FOR PRE AND POST ELECTION SURVEYS

## PRE-ELECTION RESPONSE RATE

QUARTER 1      .752

QUARTER 2	.730
QUARTER 3	.701
QUARTER 4	.641
-----	
OVERALL	.705
LENGTH OF INTERVIEW	68.0 MIN
NO. OF RESPONDENTS	2040

POST-ELECTION: NUMBER AND CUMULATIVE PERCENT OF INTERVIEWS  
BY TIME AFTER NOV. 8TH

NOV. 8- NOV. 21	970	55%
NOV. 22-DEC.05	486	82
DEC.6-DEC.19	244	96
DEC. 20-JAN.2	40	98
JAN.3-JAN.16	34	99
JAN.16-JAN.30	1	100

-----

TOTAL NO. OF RESPONDENTS 1775

RESPONSE RATE: .870

LENGTH OF INTERVIEW 60.2 MINUTES

□

>> 1988 SAMPLING INFORMATION

STUDY POPULATION

THE STUDY POPULATION FOR THE 1988 NES IS DEFINED TO INCLUDE ALL UNITED STATES CITIZENS OF VOTING AGE ON OR BEFORE THE 1988 ELECTION DAY. ELIGIBLE CITIZENS MUST HAVE RESIDED IN HOUSING UNITS, OTHER THAN ON MILITARY RESERVATIONS, IN THE FORTY-EIGHT COTERMINOUS STATES. THIS DEFINITION EXCLUDES PERSONS LIVING IN ALASKA OR HAWAII AND REQUIRES ELIGIBLE PERSONS TO HAVE BEEN BOTH A UNITED STATES CITIZEN AND EIGHTEEN YEARS OF AGE ON OR BEFORE 8 NOVEMBER 1988.

MULTI-STAGE AREA PROBABILITY SAMPLE DESIGN

THE 1988 NES IS BASED ON A MULTI-STAGE AREA PROBABILITY SAMPLE SELECTED FROM THE SURVEY RESEARCH CENTER'S (SRC) NATIONAL SAMPLE DESIGN. IDENTIFICATION OF THE 1988 NES SAMPLE RESPONDENTS WAS CONDUCTED USING A FOUR STAGE SAMPLING

PROCESS--A PRIMARY STAGE SAMPLING OF U.S. STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS (SMSA'S) (SEE CENSUS DEFINITIONS IN APPENDIX) AND COUNTIES, FOLLOWED BY A SECOND STAGE SAMPLING OF AREA SEGMENTS, A THIRD STAGE SAMPLING OF HOUSING UNITS WITHIN SAMPLED AREA SEGMENTS AND CONCLUDING WITH THE RANDOM SELECTION OF A SINGLE RESPONDENT FROM SELECTED HOUSING UNITS. A DETAILED DOCUMENTATION OF THE SRC NATIONAL SAMPLE IS PROVIDED IN THE SRC PUBLICATION ENTITLED 1980 SRC NATIONAL SAMPLE: DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT.

#### PRIMARY STAGE SELECTION

THE SELECTION OF PRIMARY STAGE SAMPLING UNITS (PSU'S) (2), WHICH DEPENDING ON THE SAMPLE STRATUM ARE EITHER SMSA'S, SINGLE COUNTIES OR GROUPINGS OF SMALL COUNTIES, IS BASED ON THE COUNTY-LEVEL 1980 CENSUS REPORTS OF POPULATION AND HOUSING.

PRIMARY STAGE UNITS WERE ASSIGNED TO 84 EXPLICIT STRATA BASED ON SMSA/NON-SMSA STATUS, PSU SIZE, AND GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION. SIXTEEN OF THE 84 STRATA CONTAIN ONLY A SINGLE SELF-REPRESENTING PSU, EACH OF WHICH IS INCLUDED WITH CERTAINTY IN THE PRIMARY STAGE OF SAMPLE SELECTION. THE REMAINING 68 NONSELF-REPRESENTING STRATA CONTAIN MORE THAN ONE PSU. FROM EACH OF THESE NONSELF-REPRESENTING STRATA,

-----

(1) PREPARED BY THE SAMPLING SECTION OF THE SURVEY RESEARCH CENTER.

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

ONE PSU WAS SAMPLED WITH PROBABILITY PROPORTIONATE TO ITS SIZE (PPS) MEASURED IN 1980 OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS. THE FULL SRC NATIONAL SAMPLE OF 84 PRIMARY STAGE SELECTIONS WAS DESIGNED TO BE OPTIMAL FOR SURVEYS ROUGHLY TWO TIMES THE SIZE OF THE 1988 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 PSU'S. EACH OF THE PARTITIONS REPRESENTS A STRATIFIED SUBSELECTION FROM THE FULL 84 PSU DESIGN.

THE SAMPLE FOR THE 1988 NES IS SELECTED FROM THE "ONE-HALF" PARTITION OF THE 1980 SRC NATIONAL SAMPLE. THE "ONE-HALF SAMPLE" INCLUDES 11 OF THE 16 SELF-REPRESENTING SMSA PSU'S AND A STRATIFIED SUBSAMPLING OF 34 (OF THE 68) NONSELF-REPRESENTING PSU'S OF THE SRC NATIONAL SAMPLE. TABLE 2 IDENTIFIES THE PSU'S FOR THE 1988 NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY BY SMSA STATUS AND REGION.

#### SECOND STAGE SELECTION OF AREA SEGMENTS

THE SECOND STAGE OF THE 1980 NATIONAL SAMPLE WAS SELECTED DIRECTLY FROM COMPUTERIZED FILES THAT WERE PREPARED FROM THE 1980 CENSUS SUMMARY TAPE FILE SERIES (STF1-B). THE DESIGNATED SECOND-STAGE SAMPLING UNITS (SSU'S), TERMED "AREA

SEGMENTS", ARE COMPRISED OF CENSUS BLOCKS IN THE METROPOLITAN PRIMARY AREAS AND ENUMERATION DISTRICTS (ED'S) IN THE RURAL NON-SMSA'S AND RURAL AREAS OF SMSA PRIMARY AREAS. EACH SSU BLOCK, BLOCK COMBINATION OR ENUMERATION DISTRICT WAS ASSIGNED A MEASURE OF SIZE EQUAL TO THE TOTAL 1980 OCCUPIED HOUSING UNIT COUNT FOR THE AREA (MINIMUM = 50). SECOND STAGE SAMPLING OF AREA SEGMENTS WAS PERFORMED WITH PROBABILITIES PROPORTIONATE TO THE ASSIGNED MEASURES OF SIZE.

A THREE-STEP PROCESS OF ORDERING THE SSU'S WITHIN THE PRIMARY AREAS PRODUCED AN IMPLICIT STRATIFICATION OF THE AREA SEGMENTS IN THE SECOND STAGE SAMPLING FRAME, STRATIFIED AT THE COUNTY LEVEL BY GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION AND POPULATION. AREA SEGMENTS WERE STRATIFIED WITHIN COUNTY AT THE MINOR CIVIL DIVISION (MCD) LEVEL BY SIZE AND INCOME, AND AT THE BLOCK AND ED LEVEL BY LOCATION WITHIN THE MCD OR COUNTY. (FOR DETAILS, REFER TO THE SRC PUBLICATION, 1980 NATIONAL SAMPLE: DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT.)

SYSTEMATIC PPS SAMPLING WAS USED TO SELECT THE AREA SEGMENTS FROM THE SECOND STAGE SAMPLING FRAME FOR EACH COUNTY. IN THE SELF-REPRESENTING (SR) PSU'S THE NUMBER OF SAMPLE AREA SEGMENTS VARIED IN PROPORTION TO THE SIZE OF THE PRIMARY STAGE UNIT, FROM A HIGH OF B=18 AREA SEGMENTS IN THE SR NEW YORK SMSA TO A LOW OF B=7 AREA SEGMENTS IN THE SMALLER SR PSU'S SUCH AS SAN FRANCISCO. A TOTAL OF B=6 AREA SEGMENTS

TABLE 2

PSU'S IN THE 1988 NES PRE- AND POST-ELECTION SURVEY  
BY: SMSA STATUS AND REGION

REGION	SMSA STATUS		
	SELF-REPRESENTING SMSA'S	NON SELF-REPRESENTING SMSA'S	NON-SMSA'S
NORTH- EAST	NEW YORK, NY-NJ PHILADELPHIA, PA-NJ	BOSTON, MA* PITTSBURGH, PA* BUFFALO, NY NEW HAVEN, CT ATLANTIC CITY, NJ MANCHESTER, NH	SCHUYLER, NY
NORTH CENTRAL	CHICAGO, IL DETROIT, MI	ST. LOUIS, MO* MILWAUKEE, WI DAYTON, OH DES MOINES, IA GRAND RAPIDS, MI FORT WAYNE, IN STEBENVILLE, OH	SANILAC, MI PHILLIPS, KS MOWER, MN
SOUTH		HOUSTON, TX* BALTIMORE, MD* BIRMINGHAM, AL COLUMBUS, GA-AL	BULLOCH, GA HALE, TX MONROE, AR BEDFORD, TN

		MIAMI, FL	ROBESON, NC
		LAKELAND, FL	
		MCALLEN, TX	
		WHEELING, WV	
		KNOXVILLE, TN	
		RICHMOND, VA	
WEST	LOS ANGELES, CA	SEATTLE, WA	ELDORADO-
	SAN FRANCISCO, CA	DENVER, WY	ALBINE, CA
		ANAHEIM, CA	CARBON, WY
		FRESNO, CA	
		EUGENE, OR	

-----

NOTE: THE PSU'S MARKED WITH AN ASTERISK (\*) ARE SELF-REPRESENTING FOR SAMPLE DESIGNS THAT USE THE TWO-THIRDS OR LARGER PORTION OF THE SAMPLE. FOR THE HALF-SAMPLE DESIGN, ONLY 6 OF THE 16 SELF-REPRESENTING AREAS REMAIN SELF-REPRESENTING. THE OTHER TEN SELF-REPRESENTING PSU'S ARE PAIRED AND ONLY FIVE ARE USED IN THE HALF-SAMPLE DESIGN, EACH REPRESENTING BOTH ITSELF AND THE PSU IT IS PAIRED WITH.

WAS SELECTED FROM EACH OF THE A=39 NONSELF-REPRESENTING (NSR) PSU'S (EXCEPT HOUSTON WHICH HAD 7 SEGMENTS SELECTED). A TOTAL OF 303 SEGMENTS WERE SELECTED, 68 IN THE SIX SELF-REPRESENTING PSU'S AND 235 IN THE NONSELF-REPRESENTING PSU'S.

#### THIRD STAGE SELECTION OF HOUSING UNITS

FOR EACH AREA SEGMENT SELECTED IN THE SECOND SAMPLING STAGE, A LISTING WAS MADE OF ALL HOUSING UNITS LOCATED WITHIN THE PHYSICAL BOUNDARIES OF THE SEGMENT. FOR SEGMENTS WITH A VERY LARGE NUMBER OF EXPECTED HOUSING UNITS, ALL HOUSING UNITS IN A SUBSELECTED PART OF THE SEGMENT WERE LISTED. THE FINAL EQUAL PROBABILITY SAMPLE OF HOUSING UNITS FOR THE 1988 NES WAS SYSTEMATICALLY SELECTED FROM THE HOUSING UNIT LISTINGS FOR THE SAMPLED AREA SEGMENTS.

IN ORDER TO DISTRIBUTE THE INTERVIEWS EVENLY ACROSS THE PRE-ELECTION PERIOD, THE SAMPLE WAS DIVIDED INTO QUARTERS: (1) SEPTEMBER 6-19; (2) SEPTEMBER 20-OCTOBER 3; (3) OCTOBER 4-17; (4) OCTOBER 18-31. (NOVEMBER 1-NOVEMBER 7 WAS "CLEAN-UP" WEEK). ONCE AN INTERVIEW WAS RELEASED FOR A GIVEN QUARTER, IT COULD BE TAKEN DURING ANY SUBSEQUENT QUARTER, ALTHOUGH 80% WERE ACTUALLY ADMINISTERED DURING THE ASSIGNED QUARTER. THE SAMPLE FROM EACH QUARTER INCLUDED ALL SAMPLE SEGMENTS. EACH QUARTER SAMPLE COULD STAND ALONE AS A PROBABILITY SAMPLE.

THE OVERALL PROBABILITY OF SELECTION FOR 1988 NES HOUSEHOLDS WAS  $F=.00003800$  OR .38 IN 10,000. THE EQUAL PROBABILITY SAMPLE OF HOUSEHOLDS WAS ACHIEVED BY USING THE STANDARD MULTI-STAGE SAMPLING TECHNIQUE OF SETTING THE SAMPLING RATE FOR SELECTING HOUSING UNITS WITHIN AREA SEGMENTS TO BE INVERSELY PROPORTIONAL TO THE PPS PROBABILITIES (SEE ABOVE) USED TO SELECT THE PSU AND AREA SEGMENT.

#### FOURTH STAGE RESPONDENT SELECTION

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

-----

(3) L. KISH, "A PROCEDURE FOR OBJECTIVE RESPONDENT SELECTION WITHIN THE HOUSEHOLD" JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN STATISTICAL ASSOCIATION, VOL. 44 (1949): PP. 380-387.

#### SAMPLE DESIGN SPECIFICATIONS

THE TARGETED COMPLETED INTERVIEW SAMPLE SIZE FOR THE 1988 NES PRE- AND POST-ELECTION SURVEY WAS N=2000 CASES. IN THE ORIGINAL SAMPLE SIZE COMPUTATION, THE FOLLOWING ASSUMPTIONS WERE MADE: RESPONSE RATE = .72, COMBINED OCCUPANCY/ELIGIBILITY RATE = .87, AND NEW CONSTRUCTION UPDATE INFLATION FACTOR = 1.03. THESE ASSUMPTIONS WERE DERIVED FROM SURVEY EXPERIENCE IN THE 1984 NES PRE-POST ELECTION SURVEY. TABLE 3 PROVIDES A FULL DESCRIPTION OF THE ORIGINAL SAMPLE DESIGN SPECIFICATIONS.

TABLE 3

#### ORIGINAL SAMPLE DESIGN SPECIFICATIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS AND ACTUAL SAMPLE DESIGN OUTCOMES

	ORIGINAL -----	ACTUAL -----
COMPLETED INTERVIEWS	2000	2040
RESPONSE RATE	.72	.705
ELIGIBLE SAMPLE HOUSEHOLDS	2778	2893
OCCUPANCY/ELIGIBILITY RATE*	.87	.826
FINAL SAMPLE HU LISTINGS	3193	3503
SAMPLE GROWTH FROM UPDATE**	1.03	1.046
SAMPLE LISTINGS FROM FRAME	3100	3349

-----

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

\*\*SINCE THE UPDATING PROCESS PRODUCES ABOUT A 3% INCREASE IN SAMPLE LINES OVER THE COUNT SELECTED FROM THE NATIONAL SAMPLE SYSTEM, THE UPDATE INFLATION FACTOR WAS SET AT 1.03

#### SAMPLE DESIGN OUTCOMES

IN COMPARING THE FIRST COLUMN OF TABLE 3 WITH THE SECOND COLUMN, IT CAN BE SEEN THAT THE SAMPLE GROWTH FROM THE UPDATE PROCEDURE WAS SLIGHTLY HIGHER THAN EXPECTED. HOWEVER, THE ORIGINAL SAMPLE DESIGN SPECIFICATIONS OVERESTIMATED THE ACTUAL RESPONSE AND OCCUPANCY/ELIGIBILITY RATES. THE ASSUMPTIONS FOR RESPONSE RATE AND

OCCUPANCY/ELIGIBILITY RATE WERE BASED ON THE RATES OBTAINED IN THE 1984 PRE-ELECTION SURVEY. THE ACTUAL OCCUPANCY/ELIGIBILITY RATE FOR THE 1988 PRE-ELECTION SURVEY (.826) WAS CLOSER TO THE RATE OBTAINED IN THE 1986 POST-ELECTION SURVEY (.835) THAN THE 1984 RATE OF .87. THE RESPONSE RATE FOR 1988

(.705) WAS BETWEEN THE 1984 RATE OF .72 AND THE 1986 RATE OF .677. THE RELEASE OF THREE RESERVE REPLICATES OF 83 SAMPLE LISTINGS EACH ALLOWED THE NUMBER OF SAMPLE LISTINGS TO BE ADJUSTED DURING THE INTERVIEW PERIOD TO REFLECT THE ACTUAL RESPONSE AND OCCUPANCY/ELIGIBILITY RATES. THEREFORE, THE NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS OBTAINED, 2040, WAS CLOSE TO THE TARGET OF 2000 INTERVIEWS.

#### WEIGHTED ANALYSIS OF 1988 NES DATA

THE AREA PROBABILITY SAMPLE DESIGN FOR THE 1988 NES RESULTS IN AN EQUAL PROBABILITY SAMPLE OF U.S. HOUSEHOLDS. HOWEVER, WITHIN SAMPLE HOUSEHOLDS A SINGLE ADULT RESPONDENT IS CHOSEN AT RANDOM TO BE INTERVIEWED. SINCE THE NUMBER OF ELIGIBLE ADULTS MAY VARY FROM ONE HOUSEHOLD TO ANOTHER, THE RANDOM SELECTION OF A SINGLE ADULT INTRODUCES INEQUALITY INTO RESPONDENTS' SELECTION PROBABILITIES. IN ANALYSIS, A RESPONDENT SELECTION WEIGHT SHOULD BE USED TO COMPENSATE FOR THESE UNEQUAL SELECTION PROBABILITIES. THE VALUE OF THE RESPONDENT SELECTION WEIGHT IS EXACTLY EQUAL TO THE NUMBER OF ELIGIBLE ADULTS IN THE HOUSEHOLD FROM WHICH THE RANDOM RESPONDENT WAS SELECTED. THE USE OF THE RESPONDENT SELECTION WEIGHT IS STRONGLY ENCOURAGED, DESPITE PAST EVALUATIONS THAT HAVE SHOWN THESE WEIGHTS TO HAVE LITTLE SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON THE VALUES OF NES ESTIMATES OF DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS.

THE CURRENT POLICY OF THE NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES IS NOT TO INCLUDE IN PUBLIC USE DATA SETS SPECIAL ANALYSIS WEIGHTS DESIGNED TO COMPENSATE FOR NONRESPONSE OR TO POST-STRATIFY THE SAMPLE TO KNOWN POPULATION DISTRIBUTION CONTROLS. ANALYSTS INTERESTED IN DEVELOPING THEIR OWN NONRESPONSE OR POST-STRATIFICATION ADJUSTMENT FACTORS MUST REQUEST ACCESS TO THE NECESSARY SAMPLE CONTROL DATA FROM THE NES BOARD.

#### SAMPLING ERRORS OF 1988 NES ESTIMATES SAMPLING ERROR CALCULATION PROGRAMS

THE PROBABILITY SAMPLE DESIGN FOR THE 1988 NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY PERMITS THE CALCULATION OF ESTIMATES OF SAMPLING ERROR FOR SURVEY STATISTICS. FOR CALCULATING SAMPLING ERRORS OF STATISTICS FROM COMPLEX SAMPLE SURVEYS, THE OSIRIS STATISTICAL ANALYSIS AND DATA MANAGEMENT SOFTWARE SYSTEM OFFERS THE PSALMS AND REPERR PROGRAMS. PSALMS IS A GENERAL PURPOSE SAMPLING ERROR PROGRAM THAT INCORPORATES THE TAYLOR SERIES APPROXIMATION APPROACH TO THE ESTIMATION OF VARIANCES OF RATIOS (INCLUDING MEANS, SCALE VARIABLES, INDICES, PROPORTIONS) AND THEIR DIFFERENCES. REPERR IS AN OSIRIS PROGRAM THAT INCORPORATES ALGORITHMS FOR REPLICATED APPROACHES TO VARIANCE ESTIMATION. BOTH BALANCED REPEATED REPLICATION (BRR) AND JACKKNIFE REPEATED REPLICATION (JRR) ARE AVAILABLE AS PROGRAM OPTIONS. THE CURRENT VERSION OF

REPERR IS BEST SUITED FOR ESTIMATING SAMPLING ERRORS AND DESIGN EFFECTS FOR REGRESSION AND CORRELATION STATISTICS.

#### SAMPLING ERROR CODES AND CALCULATION MODEL

ESTIMATION OF VARIANCES FOR COMPLEX SAMPLE SURVEY ESTIMATES REQUIRES A COMPUTATION MODEL. INDIVIDUAL DATA RECORDS MUST BE ASSIGNED SAMPLING ERROR CODES THAT REFLECT THE COMPLEX STRUCTURE OF THE SAMPLE AND ARE COMPATIBLE WITH THE COMPUTATION ALGORITHMS OF THE VARIOUS PROGRAMS. THE SAMPLING ERROR CODES FOR THE 1988 NES ARE INCLUDED AS VARIABLE 24 IN THE ICPSR DATA SET. THE ASSIGNED SAMPLING ERROR CODES ARE DESIGNED TO FACILITATE SAMPLING ERROR COMPUTATION ACCORDING TO A PAIRED SELECTION MODEL FOR BOTH TAYLOR SERIES APPROXIMATION AND REPLICATION METHOD PROGRAMS.

TABLE 4 PROVIDES A DESCRIPTION OF HOW INDIVIDUAL SAMPLING ERROR CODE VALUES ARE TO BE PAIRED FOR SAMPLING ERROR COMPUTATIONS. THIRTY (30) PAIRS OR STRATA OF SAMPLING ERROR COMPUTATION UNITS (SECU'S) ARE DEFINED. EACH SECU IN A STRATUM PAIR INCLUDES CASES ASSIGNED TO A SINGLE SAMPLING ERROR CODE VALUE. THE EXCEPTIONS ARE THE SECOND SECU IN STRATUM 27, WHICH IS COMPRISED OF CASES ASSIGNED SAMPLING CODE VALUES 36 AND 55, AND THE SECOND SECU IN STRATUM 29, WHICH IS COMPRISED OF CASES WITH SECU'S 61 AND 63.

TABLE 4

#### 1988 PRE- AND POST-ELECTION SURVEY PAIRED SELECTION MODEL FOR SAMPLING ERROR COMPUTATIONS

PAIR (STRATUM)	(SECU) 1 OF 2 CODES	(SECU) 2 OF 2 CODES
1	103	104
2	105	106
3	99	100
4	101	102
5	95	96
6	97	98
7	93	94
8	91	92
9	89	90
10	83	84
11	81	82
12	77	78
13	75	76
14	73	74
15	2	6
16	7	8
17	14	16
18	17	18
19	19	21
20	24	28
21	63	65
22	30	33



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

## GENERALIZED SAMPLING ERROR RESULTS FOR THE 1988 NES

TO ASSIST 1988 NES ANALYSTS, THE OSIRIS PSALMS PROGRAM WAS USED TO COMPUTE SAMPLING ERRORS FOR A WIDE-RANGING EXAMPLE SET OF MEANS AND PROPORTIONS ESTIMATED FROM THE 1988 NES PRE-ELECTION SURVEY DATA SET. FOR EACH ESTIMATE, SAMPLING ERRORS WERE COMPUTED FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE AND FOR FIFTEEN DEMOGRAPHIC AND POLITICAL AFFILIATION SUBCLASSES OF THE 1988 NES PRE-ELECTION SURVEY SAMPLE. THE RESULTS OF THESE SAMPLING ERROR COMPUTATIONS WERE THEN SUMMARIZED AND TRANSLATED INTO THE GENERAL USAGE SAMPLING ERROR TABLE PROVIDED IN TABLE 5.

INCORPORATING THE PATTERN OF "DESIGN EFFECTS" OBSERVED IN THE EXTENSIVE SET OF EXAMPLE COMPUTATIONS, TABLE 5 PROVIDES APPROXIMATE STANDARD ERRORS FOR PERCENTAGE ESTIMATES BASED ON THE 1988 NES. TO USE THE TABLE, EXAMINE THE COLUMN HEADING TO FIND THE PERCENTAGE VALUE THAT BEST APPROXIMATES THE VALUE OF THE ESTIMATED PERCENTAGE THAT IS OF INTEREST. (4) NEXT, LOCATE THE APPROXIMATE SAMPLE SIZE BASE (DENOMINATOR FOR THE PROPORTION) IN THE LEFT-HAND ROW MARGIN OF THE TABLE. TO FIND THE APPROXIMATE STANDARD ERROR OF A PERCENTAGE ESTIMATE, SIMPLY CROSS-REFERENCE THE APPROPRIATE COLUMN (PERCENTAGE) AND ROW (SAMPLE SIZE BASE). NOTE: THE TABULATED VALUES REPRESENT APPROXIMATELY ONE STANDARD ERROR FOR THE PERCENTAGE ESTIMATE. TO CONSTRUCT AN APPROXIMATE CONFIDENCE INTERVAL, THE ANALYST SHOULD APPLY THE APPROPRIATE CRITICAL POINT FROM THE "Z" DISTRIBUTION (E.G. Z=1.96 FOR A TWO-SIDED 95% CONFIDENCE INTERVAL HALF-WIDTH). FURTHERMORE, THE APPROXIMATE STANDARD ERRORS IN THE TABLE APPLY ONLY TO SINGLE POINT ESTIMATES OF PERCENTAGES NOT TO THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN TWO PERCENTAGE ESTIMATES.

THE GENERALIZED VARIANCE RESULTS PRESENTED IN TABLE 5 ARE A USEFUL TOOL FOR INITIAL, CURSORY EXAMINATION OF THE NES SURVEY RESULTS. FOR MORE IN DEPTH ANALYSIS AND REPORTING OF CRITICAL ESTIMATES, ANALYSTS ARE ENCOURAGED TO COMPUTE EXACT ESTIMATES OF STANDARD ERRORS USING THE APPROPRIATE CHOICE OF A SAMPLING ERROR PROGRAM AND COMPUTATION MODEL.

-----

(4) THE STANDARD ERROR OF A PERCENTAGE IS A SYMMETRIC FUNCTION WITH ITS MAXIMUM CENTERED AT P=50%; I.E., THE STANDARD ERROR OF P=40% AND P=60% ESTIMATES ARE EQUAL.

TABLE 5

1988 NES PRE-ELECTION SURVEY GENERALIZED VARIANCE TABLE  
APPROXIMATE STANDARD ERRORS FOR PERCENTAGES

FOR PERCENTAGE ESTIMATES NEAR

SAMPLE N	50%	40% OR 60%	30% OR 70%	20% OR 80%	10% OR 90%
THE APPROXIMATE STANDARD ERROR OF THE PERCENTAGE IS:					
100	5.385	5.277	4.933	4.308	3.231
200	3.912	3.824	3.581	3.128	2.343
300	3.278	3.210	3.006	2.260	1.962
400	2.905	2.846	2.661	2.324	1.743
500	2.663	2.603	2.437	2.128	1.593
750	2.294	2.244	2.094	1.657	1.250
1000	2.078	2.039	1.907	1.657	1.250
1500	1.846	1.803	1.688	1.474	1.102
2000	1.722	1.691	1.568	1.368	1.030
2040	1.716	1.685	1.561	1.298	1.020

□

>> 1988 VOTE VALIDATION STUDY

THE VOTE VALIDATION STUDY IS THE RESULT OF A SYSTEMATIC CHECK OF THE REGISTRATION AND/OR VOTING RECORDS OF 1988 ELECTION STUDY RESPONDENTS WHO REPORTED THAT THEY WERE REGISTERED AND WHERE. SIMILAR RECORD CHECKS WERE DONE FOR 1964, 1972, 1974 1976, 1980, 1984, AND 1986 RESPONDENTS.

THE MOTIVATION FOR THESE STUDIES CONTINUES TO BE FOUND IN THE DIFFERENCE IN ESTIMATES OF NATIONAL TURNOUT AS DERIVED FROM: 1) AGGREGATING OFFICIAL VOTE TOTALS FROM ELECTION OFFICES ACROSS THE UNITED STATES AND DIVIDING BY THE ESTIMATED NUMBER OF AGE-ELIGIBLE U. S. CITIZENS; AND 2) DIVIDING THE NUMBER OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS WHO ANSWERED THAT THEY VOTED BY THE TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS IN THE SURVEY. THE LATTER ESTIMATE IS ALMOST ALWAYS 10-12% LOWER.

WHILE SOME PORTION OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE TWO ESTIMATES IS DUE TO THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE TWO DENOMINATORS-- I.E., THE POPULATION OF THOSE AGREEING TO BE INTERVIEWED IN A SURVEY IS DEMONSTRABLY DIFFERENT FROM THE POPULATION OF ALL CITIZENS OVER 18-- ANOTHER LARGE PORTION OF THIS DIFFERENCE IS THOUGHT TO BE EXPLAINED BY THE MISREPORTING OF VOTING BEHAVIOR TO INTERVIEWERS BY RESPONDENTS. SOME RESPONDENTS REPORT THAT THEY VOTED WHEN IN FACT THEY HAVE NOT DONE SO. BECAUSE THE INTERVIEW IS A SOCIAL SITUATION AND VOTING IS A NORM, IN ORDER NOT TO

REPORT THE VIOLATION OF A NORM, SOME RESPONDENTS PREFER TO TELL INTERVIEWERS THAT THEY VOTED. (SOME MAY BELIEVE THAT THIS IS A MORE REPRESENTATIVE STATEMENT OF THEIR USUAL CIVIC INVOLVEMENT THAN THE HAPPENSTANCE OF THEIR NOT VOTING IN THE MOST RECENT ELECTION.)

THE MOTIVATION FOR THE RECORDS CHECK IS NOT SO MUCH TO STUDY THE INTERESTING SOCIAL PHENOMENON OF MISREPORTING AS IT IS TO CLARIFY TO THE ANALYST WHO ACTUALLY DID VOTE AND WHO PROBABLY DID NOT. OVER-REPORT IS AN OBVIOUS PROBLEM FOR ANALYSIS OF PARTICIPATION AND IT MAY ALSO BE A PROBLEM IN THE ANALYSIS OF VOTE CHOICE.

THE ONLY WAY TO TELL IF SOMEONE ACTUALLY VOTED IS TO LOOK AT THE VOTING AND REGISTRATION RECORDS IN THE LOCAL ELECTION OFFICE CORRESPONDING TO WHERE THE RESPONDENT LIVES (OR TELLS THE INTERVIEWER THAT HE IS REGISTERED). FOR THE NES ELECTION STUDIES, THIS PROCEDURE WAS USED BY SENDING SRC INTERVIEWERS (IN 1984, 1986 AND 1988, THESE WERE OFTEN FIELD SUPERVISORS) TO PERFORM THE RECORD SEARCH AND INSPECTION. EACH TIME VALIDATION HAS BEEN ATTEMPTED IN THIS MANNER, STAFF HAVE FOUND THAT A SMALL PROPORTION (3-5%) OF RESPONDENTS: A) REPORTED THAT THEY VOTED; AND B) HAVE A REGISTRATION RECORD IN THE ELECTION OFFICE; BUT C) ARE NOT INDICATED IN THE VOTING RECORD AS HAVING VOTED IN THE

ELECTION. LEAVING ASIDE THE QUESTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE ERRORS, THE PRESUMPTION IS THAT THESE R'S ACTUALLY DID NOT VOTE.

THERE IS ANOTHER SET OF RESPONDENTS WHO REPORTED THAT THEY VOTED BUT FOR WHOM INTERVIEWERS ARE UNABLE TO FIND A REGISTRATION RECORD AT ALL. THE NES STUDY STAFF IS CONVINCED OF THE DILIGENCE AND TENACIOUS PERSISTENCE OF THE SRC REPRESENTATIVES SEARCHING FOR THESE RECORDS, AND BELIEVES THAT FOR THE VERY GREAT MAJORITY OF THIS SET OF RESPONDENTS, THERE IS INDEED NO ONE REGISTERED AT THAT OFFICE, WITH THAT NAME. THE NES STAFF IS NOT NECESSARILY CONVINCED OF HAVING THE RIGHT ADDRESS FOR THIS PERSON, OR THE RIGHT NAME, OR THE RIGHT NAME SPELLED CLOSE ENOUGH TO THE VERSION ON THE REGISTRATION RECORDS, TO ENABLE SUCCESS IN FINDING THE RESPONDENT'S RECORD.

THE NES STAFF DOES NOT VALIDATE THE REPORTED REGISTRATION AND/OR VOTE OF EVERY RESPONDENT IN THE STUDY. IT IS ACCEPTED WITHOUT FURTHER CHECK THE REPORT OF THOSE WHO SAID THEY ARE NOT REGISTERED. AND THE RECORDS CANNOT BE CHECKED OF THOSE WHO DIDN'T GIVE THEIR NAME. IN RARE INSTANCES, AN ELECTION OFFICE WILL REFUSE ACCESS TO RECORDS AND RESPONDENTS SERVED BY THESE OFFICES ALSO CANNOT BE VALIDATED.

THE VOTE VALIDATION PORTION OF THE DATAFILE CONTAINS A NUMBER OF SUMMARY VARIABLES REPORTING THE RESULTS OF THE RECORD CHECK. THE SUMMARY VARIABLE V881147 ASSIGNS A VALUE OF VOTING OR NOT VOTING TO EVERY RESPONDENT IN THE STUDY. WHERE STAFF WAS UNABLE OR DID NOT CHECK THE RECORDS, RESPONDENT'S SELF-REPORT WAS ASSIGNED. IT IS THIS VARIABLE THAT REPRESENTS, IN THE STUDY STAFF'S VIEW, THE MAXIMUM CLARIFICATION POSSIBLE OF WHETHER OR NOT THE RESPONDENT

ACTUALLY VOTED IN THE 1988 ELECTION

OF 2040 CASES IN THE 1988 ELECTION STUDY, 1413 WERE EARMARKED FOR VALIDATION. THE 1413 FIGURE INCLUDES 252 OF THE 265 CASES WITH NO POST INTERVIEW IN 1988.

OF THE 2040 TOTAL RESPONDENTS, 375 WERE NOT VALIDATED FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

19	-	NO NAME*
3	-	OFFICE REFUSED**
11	-	R DK IF REGISTERED; NOT REQUIRED TO REGISTER
342	-	NOT REGISTERED***

\* 11 OF THESE HAD NO POST INTERVIEW

\*\* 2 OF THESE HAD NO POST INTERVIEW

\*\*\* OF 344 IN THIS CATEGORY, 2 ALSO HAD NO NAME AND ARE INCLUDED IN THE 19 WITH NO NAMES

IN ADDITION, 35 CASES EARMARKED FOR VALIDATION COULD NOT BE VERIFIED BECAUSE THE R WAS NOT REGISTERED AT HIS/HER SAMPLE LOCATION AND THE IWR CHECKED RECORDS AT THE ELECTION OFFICE SERVING THE SAMPLE LOCATION INSTEAD OF THE ELECTION OFFICE OF R'S ASSERTED REGISTRATION. THESE CASES ARE DESIGNATED CODE 9 IN V1118.

>> 1988 ELECTION ADMINISTRATION SURVEY

THE ELECTION ADMINISTRATION DATASET IS PART OF THE 1988 VOTE VALIDATION STUDY. IN ORDER TO BETTER UNDERSTAND THE RESULTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL VOTER RECORD SEARCH CONDUCTED FOR RESPONDENTS TO THE 1988 PRE-POST ELECTION SURVEYS, AN INTERVIEW WAS CONDUCTED WITH THE ELECTION ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL IN CHARGE OF THE ELECTION OFFICE PERTAINING TO THE SAMPLE SEGMENT IN WHICH RESPONDENTS LIVED.

INTERVIEWS WERE OBTAINED WITH OFFICIALS IN 120 OFFICES. THIS INTERVIEW USED A STRUCTURED QUESTIONNAIRE THAT WAS DESIGNED TO GATHER INFORMATION IN THREE AREAS: 1) HOW REGISTRATION AND VOTING RECORDS ARE KEPT AND UPDATED; 2) CONVENIENCE OF REGISTRATION IN THE JURISDICTION AND 3) INTERVIEWER EVALUATION OF OFFICE ORGANIZATION, EFFICIENCY AND COOPERATION.

A NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS IN THE 1988 ELECTION STUDY WERE NOT VALIDATED FOR ANY OF SEVERAL REASONS; FOR EXAMPLE, THEY REPORTED THAT THEY WERE NOT REGISTERED AND DID NOT VOTE; AND/OR THEY DID NOT PROVIDE THEIR NAME; AND/OR THEY WERE REGISTERED AT SOME PLACE OUTSIDE OF THE ANES SAMPLE AREAS. IN THESE CASES, OFFICE DATA WAS ATTACHED TO RESPONDENTS

BASED ON THEIR SAMPLE ADDRESS.

□

>> 1988 NES STAFF AND TECHNICAL PAPERS

BREHM, JOHN. (1985A) "REPORT ON CODING OF ECONOMIC CONDITIONS SERIES IN THE 1984 PRE-POST ELECTION STUDY: A REPORT TO THE BOARD OF OVERSEERS, NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES." WORKING PAPER NO. 8. ANN ARBOR: CPS, JUNE 1985.

BREHM, JOHN. (1985B) "ANALYSIS OF RESULT CODE DISPOSITION FOR CONTINUOUS MONITORING BY TIME IN FIELD: REPORT TO THE BOARD OF OVERSEERS, NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES." WORKING PAPER NO. 7. ANN ARBOR: CPS, AUGUST 1985.

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

BREHM, JOHN. (1987A) "HOW REPRESENTATIVE IS THE 1986 POST-ELECTION SURVEY?" MEMO TO BOARD OF OVERSEERS, NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES, MAY 1987.

BREHM, JOHN. (1987B) "WHO'S MISSING? AN ANALYSIS OF NONRESPONSE IN THE 1986 ELECTION STUDY: A REPORT TO THE BOARD OF OVERSEERS, NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES." WORKING PAPER NO. 10. ANN ARBOR: CPS, DECEMBER 1987.

BREHM, JOHN AND SANTA TRAUOGOTT. (1986) "SIMILARITY AND REPRESENTATIVENESS OF THE 1985 PILOT HALF-SAMPLES." MEMO TO THE NES 1985 PILOT STUDY COMMITTEE MARCH, 1986.

LAKE, CELINDA. (1983A) "SIMILARITY AND REPRESENTATIVENESS OF 1983 PILOT SAMPLES." MEMO TO NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES 1984 PLANNING COMMITTEE, SEPTEMBER 1983.

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

LAKE, CELINDA. (1984) "CODING OF INDEPENDENT/INDEPENDENTS AND APOLITICALS IN THE PARTY IDENTIFICATION SUMMARY CODE AND APOLITICALS IN THE ROLLING CROSS-SECTION." MEMO TO BOARD OF OVERSEERS, NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES. FEBRUARY 1984.

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

MORCHIO, GIOVANNA AND MARIA SANCHEZ. (1984) "CREATION OF A FILTER VARIABLE TO BE USED WHEN ANALYZING QUESTIONS ABOUT CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATES IN THE 1982 INTEGRATED PERSONAL/ISR CATI/BERKELEY CATI DATASET: A REPORT TO THE BOARD OF OVERSEERS, NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES." WORKING PAPER NO. 1, ANN ARBOR: CPS, FEBRUARY 1984.

- MORCHIO, GIOVANNA AND MARIA SANCHEZ. (1984) "COMPARISON OF THE MICHIGAN METHOD OF DISTRICT ASSIGNMENT ON THE TELEPHONE WITH THE PERSONAL INTERVIEW SIMULATED DATA: A REPORT TO THE BOARD OF OVERSEERS, NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES." WORKING PAPER NO. 2. ANN ARBOR: CPS, MARCH 1984.
- MORCHIO, GIOVANNA, MARIA SANCHEZ AND SANTA TRAUOGOTT. (1985) "MODE DIFFERENCES: DK RESPONSES IN THE 1984 POST-ELECTION SURVEY: A REPORT TO THE BOARD OF OVERSEERS, NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES." WORKING PAPER NO. 9. ANN ARBOR: CPS, NOVEMBER 1985.
- MORCHIO, GIOVANNA AND SANTA TRAUOGOTT. (1986) "CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT ASSIGNMENT IN AN RDD SAMPLE: RESULTS OF 1982 CATI EXPERIMENT." MEMO TO THE 1986 PILOT PLANNING COMMITTEE. FEBRUARY 1986.
- NES STAFF. (1984) "QUESTIONS AND VERSIONS IN NES CONTINUOUS MONITORING, 1984: A REPORT TO THE BOARD OF OVERSEERS, NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES." WORKING PAPER NO. 3. ANN ARBOR: CPS, AUGUST 1984.
- NES STAFF. (1984) "WEEKLY FIELD REPORT FOR THE NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES CONTINUOUS MONITORING, JAN. 11-AUG. 3, 1984: A REPORT TO THE BOARD OF OVERSEERS, NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES." WORKING PAPER NO. 4. ANN ARBOR: CPS, AUGUST 1984.
- NES STAFF. (1985) "PROGRESS OF THE ROLLING CROSS SECTION." MEMO TO NES BOARD OF OVERSEERS, FEBRUARY 1985.
- NES STAFF. (UNDATED) "YEARS OF SCHOOLING." UNPUBLISHED STAFF MEMO.
- NES STAFF. (UNDATED) "NEWSPAPER CODE." UNPUBLISHED STAFF MEMO.
- TRAUOGOTT, SANTA. (1984) "TWO VERSIONS OF THE ABORTION QUESTION." UNPUBLISHED STAFF MEMO TO THE NES BOARD OF OVERSEERS, JUNE 1984.
- TRAUOGOTT, SANTA. (1985) "SAMPLE WEIGHTING IN NES CONTINUOUS MONITORING, 1984.: A REPORT TO THE BOARD OF OVERSEERS, NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES," WORKING PAPER NO. 5. ANN ARBOR: CPS, APRIL 1985.
- TRAUOGOTT, SANTA. (1985) "SAMPLE WEIGHTING IN NES PRE-POST ELECTION SURVEY, 1984: A REPORT TO THE BOARD OF OVERSEERS, NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES," WORKING PAPER NO. 6. ANN ARBOR: CPS, APRIL 1985.
- TRAUOGOTT, SANTA. (1985) "ASSESSMENT OF MEDIA MEASURES IN RXS." UNPUBLISHED STAFF MEMO, JULY 1985.
- TRAUOGOTT, SANTA. (1985) "ASSESSMENT OF MEDIA MEASURES IN PRE-POST" UNPUBLISHED STAFF MEMO, JULY 1985.
- TRAUOGOTT, SANTA. (UNDATED) "THE POLITICAL INTEREST VARIABLE

ON THE 1984 ELECTION STUDY." UNPUBLISHED STAFF MEMO TO  
NES PLANNING COMMITTEE.

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

>> 1987 PILOT STUDY REPORTS

CONOVER, PAMELA JOHNSTON AND STANLEY FELDMAN. MEASURING  
PATRIOTISM AND NATIONALISM.

CONOVER, PAMELA JOHNSTON AND DAVID LOWERY. PILOT STUDY  
QUESTIONS ON WELFARE/POVERTY.

CRAIG, STEPHEN AND RICHARD NIEMI. POLITICAL EFFICACY AND  
TRUST. SEPTEMBER 25, 1987.

FELDMAN, STANLEY. EVALUATION OF NEW EQUALITY ITEMS.  
SEPTEMBER 29, 1987.

KNIGHT, KATHLEEN. MEASUREMENT OF LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE  
IDENTIFICATION. SEPTEMBER 23, 1987.

NIEMI, RICHARD, CHARLES HADLEY, AND HAROLD STANLEY.  
NATIONAL AND STATE PARTY IDENTIFICATION. SEPTEMBER 25,  
1987.

NIEMI, RICHARD AND HERB WEISBERG. 1987 PILOT STUDY "FORCE  
CHOICE" PARTY IDENTIFICATION QUESTION EXPERIMENT.  
SEPTEMBER 25, 1987.

PEFFLEY, MARK AND JON HURWITZ. REPORT ON FOREIGN POLICY  
ITEMS, 1987 PILOT STUDY.

SHINGLES, RICHARD. REPORT ON MEASURES OF EFFICACY AND  
TRUST. SEPTEMBER 28, 1987. MEMORANDUM.

REPORT. NEW MEASURES OF SUBJECTIVE POLITICAL EFFICACY  
AND POLITICAL TRUST. SEPTEMBER 28, 1987. ADDENDUM  
TABLE 4. SUPPLEMENTS 1, 2, 3.

STOKER, LAURA L. MORALITY AND POLITICS: CONDUCT AND  
CONTROL. A REPORT ON NEW ITEMS IN THE 1987 NATIONAL  
ELECTION PILOT STUDY. SEPTEMBER 1987.

TATE, KATHERINE. WHITES' PERCEPTIONS OF GROUP ECONOMIC  
DIFFERENCES. SEPTEMBER 28, 1987.

ZALLER, JOHN AND STANLEY FELDMAN. FRAME OF REFERENCE AND  
THE SURVEY RESPONSE. FELDMAN AND ZALLER MEMORANDUM,  
SEPTEMBER 27, 1987.

□>> DESCRIPTION OF REVALIDATION OF 1988 VOTE (1991)

This dataset consists of the results of a revalidation of voting and registration as reported by respondents to the 1988 Election Study. The re-looking up of these records was carried out in conjunction with the 1990 Vote Validation Study. It was done in order to measure the error in the vote validation process itself. The vote validation study carried out in July-August of 1991 was the eighth time that NES has done a voter validation study. Previous validations were done for the 1964, 1976, 1978, 1980, 1984, 1986, and 1988 Post Election Studies.

The voter validation study is carried out by sending name and address information for respondents who say they are registered to vote, to a Survey Research Center field interviewer, who is instructed to check with the local office at which respondents report being registered for the purpose of locating the registration records of these respondents and to ascertain whether or not the records show that the respondents voted in the most recent general election.

It is important to note that the search is conducted by people who are trained in survey methods but not in records management, and who may themselves vary in terms of their understanding of the records, their pertinacity, the thoroughness by which every avenue in the records is explored, and so on. It was recommended to the NES Board of Overseers that revalidation of the 1988 Election Study would be an appropriate and modest first step in determining the extent to which vote validation findings are related to the process itself.(1) Accordingly, the Board decided that 1988 respondents should be validated at the same time as the 1990 respondents, to the extent that offices scheduled to be visited for the 1990 respondents also encompassed the 1988 respondents.

The procedures and forms used for the 1988 respondents were identical to those used for the 1990 respondents. The 1990 forms and procedures are similar to, but distinct from, those used in 1988. In most cases, the SRC field personnel who did the lookups in 1990 were not the same people who did the 1988 lookups. If there are interviewer effects, these would show up as different interviewers conduct record checks on the same people in the same offices.

#### A. The "Office" Variables

In order to conduct elections honestly, lists of eligible voters are generated by each election office, with each voter assigned to one and only one precinct. Therefore, for the purpose of registration and voting, an individual must be associated with one and only one address, belonging in one and only one electoral jurisdiction.

Since NES respondents come from a national area probability sample, a large number of different election offices are included in the validation study, usually over 100.

-----  
 (1) Presser, S., Traugott, M. and Traugott, S. "Extending Methodological Development of Survey Response Errors for Voting." Memo to the Board of Overseers, Feb. 1991.

The jurisdiction of these election offices is usually the county but in New



England and a few other states, registration and voting records are maintained at a local level, including townships.

Because of the diversity in record keeping and access across these many offices, the vote validation dataset has two conceptual parts. The most obvious part is the results of the record check for individual respondents. The other part, the office variables, may perhaps be labeled "contextual" data, for these variables describe the search procedure and the records themselves.

We include the variables describing the records and the search procedure because the relationship between the respondent's report and what is found or not found in official records is not necessarily a straightforward one. One view of the matching process is that the official records are always correct, and that in the event of discrepancy, the respondent must have "misreported" his or her behavior. Another view is that the records themselves are but another form of measurement of a particular behavior, and as such, are subject to measurement error. So, for example, the computerized transcription of poll records, which are the records which have been checked in most offices, could be inaccurate. The situation is made more complex by the fact that there appears to be an irreducible minimum proportion of respondents for whom a record of registration cannot be located at all, and logically, it is difficult if not impossible to say that this negative finding demonstrates beyond doubt that respondents are not registered. It is always possible that with a "better" search, a more accurate spelling of the person's name, a correct understanding of where the person is actually registered, the record would have been located.

We think the user needs information not only about what we have found, but what the records themselves are like, and what the search was like, so that the user can make some evaluation of whether record-respondent discrepancies cluster in-particular patterns of record keeping or search.(2)

Information about the records, and the search process, was coded from several sources. First, the SRC interviewer who did the records check administered a brief (10-15 minute) -questionnaire to an official in the records office asking specifically about how the records were organized. The purpose of this interaction was for the interviewer to gain information to enable her to conduct the records search efficiently.

Second, as the interviewer went on to fill out the forms recording the results of individual record checks, that is, to actually use the records that had been described, her

(2) This view has been evolving within NES for some period of time. The following technical reports, papers and other memoranda trace this development: Traugott, S., (1989) Validating Self-Reported Vote, 1964-1988; Presser, S; Traugott, S. and Traugott M. (1990) "Vote 'Over' Reporting in Surveys: The Records or the Respondents"; and Traugott, S. and Morchio, G. "1990 Vote Validation" (1991). Any of these papers or reports are available by contacting NES project staff.

understanding of the records often changed, sometimes by the discovery of additional sources not originally described to her. These discoveries were annotated on the forms themselves, rather than on the office interview. The NES staff reviewed all of the individual record check forms from a particular office in conjunction with the election official's questionnaire.

A third source of information, used somewhat tentatively because of the possibility of change in the intervening time, was the previous interviews

conducted in the same office. (NES has been in the same sample frame since 1984, and many of these offices have been visited three previous times.) These interviews were used to elucidate points that were not clear. Finally, for between 20-30% of the offices, various points remained unclear and the offices and/or the SRC interviewers were called by the NES staff for further information.

All of these sources were used in the coding of the office variables (V882103-V882149). The chief focus of the office variables is in what sources were actually used by the interviewer, and how they were used. We do not describe in detail all of the records that the office keeps. These office variables differ in focus from previous codings of office variables, where the interest was in describing the office records themselves, rather than those used. The reason for this is that as we read through the materials, we were struck by how frequently sources which were theoretically available were not used because they were not readily accessible. For example, the office might have a computerized system for keeping track of registrants. But, it is in another building, and we don't have access to it on anything but printouts. Or, the computer is "down." Often, poll books are stored off-site, and offices are reluctant to retrieve them for our inspection, claiming that "everything on them is on the computer." Hence, while we attach the office interview schedule itself as part of the documentation, the user should be aware that the office variables are not a direct transcription from this questionnaire, but rather address the somewhat different question of what sources were actually used.

#### B. The Lookup Process

If election offices share a common central mission, that of conducting elections without fraud, they also display a bewildering variety of terms for similar procedures, to say nothing of widely different procedures to achieve the same ends. There are places with numerous versions of sophisticated computer tracking, and places with one set of poll ledgers. The supervisors of these offices can be highly professional, or, in one or two cases, obvious political appointees. Some offices boast the latest in computer technology, including digitized signatures and bar codes over which a wand can be passed to register that a person has voted; while others make do with signatures and initials on the original registration card. We have validated in jurisdictions having voters numbering in the millions and thousands of precincts and in places where there is one precinct with several hundred registrants.

Each year we face the difficulty of trying to train survey interviewers in how to diagnose the intricacies of records management in the offices they are likely to encounter, so that they can use ALL the sources potentially available to them efficiently in the actual lookup process. In 1984, we hit upon the strategy of conducting an interview with an election official, prior to actually looking up the records, so that the look-up person would have a detailed idea of what records were available to her. Each time we do this, we struggle to improve this office questionnaire so that it will better lead the naive interviewer through the maze of different office procedures.

Although NES staff is somewhat removed from the complexities of each individual office, we try to write some general instructions to guide the interviewers in the lookup process. For this study, the task of the interviewer was described to them as first finding a record that they were reasonably sure was the respondent's; then, ascertaining what the record showed about whether the respondent voted or did not vote in the general elections of 1990 and 1988. It was explained that all offices maintain a list of who is registered in their jurisdiction. From this master list, all offices send to each polling place a list in some form of who is eligible to vote at

that voting place. When people vote, some mark is made to indicate that they done so (to reduce the possibility of fraud, following the time honored rule of one person, one vote.) Information about whether a person did or did not vote may or may not be posted back to the master office list of who is registered. There are many variations on this scheme: for example, some offices divide the master list (which is on cards) into precinct binders and send these out to the polls where they are marked.) Thus, the master list is also the poll book. However, the general outline is simple.

Based on this general outline, and assuming that most offices post vote information back to the registration record, interviewers were to look first at the master registration record for evidence that R had voted. If the record did not show that R voted, they were to look at the original poll books, to the extent they were available, for some further indication of vote. (Historiographers will recognize the distinction between primary and secondary sources, one that has been slow to dawn on us as survey researchers.) One example will illustrate the importance of primary sources. An interviewer happened to be a registered voter in a county where she was looking up records. She noted that many more respondents appeared to have voted in 1990 than in 1988. She thought this was strange. Accordingly, she looked up her own record for 1988, and found that the computer did not show her as voting, although she had. It didn't show her son or husband as voting either, although they voted with her. The original poll records, however, showed she and her family as voting. It turned out that there had been a sizeable transcription error in 1988, in this office.

As the NES staff evaluated what we received back from interviewers, both record check forms and election official interviews, it was clear that in many offices, original sources were not used, either because they were not made available to the interviewer (sometimes they are destroyed after information has been posted to the computer) or because the interviewer did not press for access to these sources. Also, some interviewers went about their task in a way exactly contrary to instructions, i.e., they looked first at the poll records, and then searched the registration records for people they couldn't locate. The trouble with this strategy is that some nontrivial proportion of people are not registered to vote in the precinct in which they were interviewed; rather they vote somewhere else in the same jurisdiction. Starting with the poll books means considerably more going back and forth between registration records and poll records; in this process, it is much more difficult for the interviewer with a sizeable number of cases in an office to keep track of exactly which sources she has or has not used in a particular case. (3)

### C. Contents of the Dataset

The present dataset is very similar in structure to the 1990 vote validation dataset; containing variables about the results of the individual respondent lookup as well as about the lookup procedure itself. A few variables from the 1988 vote validation are included; these are the results of the lookup, i.e., whether or not a registration record was found and whether or not the respondent appears to have voted in 1988.

There are 2040 records in the 1988 Revalidation dataset, one record for each respondent in the 1988 Pre-Election Study. We have "padded" the vote validation dataset by adding records with missing data codes for 1988 respondents who were not validated.

The dataset which we are releasing now has variables from several sources. These are:

1. Variables about the individual respondents from the 1988 Election Study, including self-reported vote and registration. All variables which were generated for the coversheet, with the exception of name, address and geographic information, are included.
2. Variables from the individual record check form filled out by the interviewer in the election office. These are variables 882003-882046.
4. Variables describing the sources used and the search procedure in the election records office in which the respondent's record was looked up. (Variables 882103-882149). There will be no further release of the office level information.

While this is a "stand-alone" dataset, most users will find it most useful merged back into the 1988 Election Study. Merging should be relatively simple because there is one record for the vote validation dataset for each record in the 1988 Pre-Election Study.

(3) In fairness to the interviewers, we should say that our interviewers are entirely dependent on the good will of the people assisting them in any given office. Often, these people had an understandable interest in minimizing the time devoted to helping our interviewer and the interviewers were reluctant to press them with timeconsuming requests for original sources. In retrospect, the NES staff needed to do much more to prepare the offices and the interviewers about resources would be needed to complete the lookup task.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE NES BOARD OF OVERSEERS  
February, 1991

Stanley Feldman	State University of New York, Stony Brook
Morris J. Fiorina	Harvard University
Mary Jackman	University of California, Davis
Gary Jacobson	University of California, San Diego
David Leege	Notre Dame University
Thomas Mann	The Brookings Institution
Douglas Rivers	Stanford University
John Zaller	University of California, Los Angeles

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS

Warren E. Miller	Arizona State University
Donald R. Kinder	University of Michigan
Steven J. Rosenstone	University of Michigan

STUDY STAFF

Associated with the 1991 Panel/Pilot Study

Santa Traugott	NES Project Manager
Thomas M. Ivacko	Study Manager, NES
Fran Eliot	Research Assistant, NES
Zoanne Blackburn	Study Manager, SRC/Telephone Facility

□

>> 1988 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 number of decimal places is also indicated (e.g. "NUMERIC DEC 4")

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

Line 7 - Actual question text for survey variables or a description of non-survey variables (for example, congressional district). Survey items usually include the question number (for example "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.

□

>> 1988 ICPSR PROCESSING INFORMATION

THE DATA COLLECTION WAS PROCESSED ACCORDING TO THE STANDARD ICPSR PROCESSING PROCEDURES FOR CLASS I DATA COLLECTIONS. THE DATA WERE CHECKED FOR ILLEGAL OR INCONSISTENT CODE VALUES WHICH, WHEN FOUND, WERE EITHER CORRECTED OR RECODED TO MISSING DATA VALUES. EXTENSIVE CONSISTENCY CHECKS WERE PERFORMED. STATEMENTS BRACKETED IN "<" AND ">" SIGNS IN THE BODY OF THE CODEBOOK WERE ADDED BY THE PROCESSORS FOR EXPLANATORY PURPOSES.

□

>> 1988 VARIABLE DESCRIPTION LIST

#### ICPSR VARIABLES

VERSION NES VERISON NUMBER  
 DSETNO NES DATASET NUMBER  
 880001 ICPSR ARCHIVE NUMBER- 9196  
 880004 RESPONDENT PRE-ELECTION CASE ID

#### SAMPLING INFORMATION

880005 PRIMARY AREA CODE  
 880006 PRIMARY AREA NAME  
 880007 SEGMENT NUMBER  
 880008 CENSUS REGION  
 880009 POSTAL STATE ABBREVIATION AND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT NUMBER  
 880010 FIPS STATE CODE  
 880011 FIPS STATE AND COUNTY CODE  
 880012 ICPSR STATE CODE  
 880013 ICPSR STATE AND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT CODE  
 880014 TRACT/ENUMERATION DISTRICT INDICATOR  
 880015 1980 CENSUS TRACT  
 880016 1980 CENSUS ENUMERATION DISTRICT  
 880017 1980 CENSUS PLACE CODE  
 880018 FIPS 1980 SMSA CODE

880019 FIPS 1980 SCSA CODE  
 880020 SIZE OF PLACE OF INTERVIEW  
 880021 ACTUAL POPULATION OF PLACE OF INTERVIEW  
 880022 1980 BELT CODE  
 880023 1980 MINOR CIVIL DIVISION  
 880024 SAMPLING ERROR CODE  
 880025 SELECTION TABLE

## PRE-ELECTION INFORMATION

880026 INTERVIEWER'S ID NUMBER  
 880027 REFUSAL CONVERSION INDICATOR  
 880028 PERSUASION LETTER REQUESTED  
 880029 FINAL CALL NUMBER  
 880030 FINAL RESULT CODE  
 880031 IF R IS FEMALE, HAS R LEGALLY CHANGED HER NAME  
 880032 PHONE NUMBER OBTAINED  
 880033 INTERVIEWER'S RACE  
 880034 INTERVIEWER'S ETHNICITY  
 880035 INTERVIEWER'S AGE, BRACKETED  
 880036 INTERVIEWER'S YEARS OF WORK, BRACKETED  
  
 880037 INTERVIEWER'S SEX  
 880038 INTERVIEWER'S EDUCATION, BRACKETED  
 880039 INTERVIEW QUARTER CODE  
 880040 FORM TYPE  
 880041 INTERVIEW PRIMARY AREA  
 880042 INTERVIEWER'S INTERVIEW NUMBER  
 880043 DATE COMPLETED - MONTH  
 880044 DATE COMPLETED - DAY  
 880045 LENGTH OF INTERVIEW  
 880046 LENGTH OF POST-EDITING  
 880047 BEGINNING TIME - LOCAL

## POST-ELECTION INFORMATION

880048 RESPONDENT POST-ELECTION CASE ID  
 880049 INTERVIEWER'S ID NUMBER  
 880050 TYPE OF CONGRESSIONAL RACE  
 880051 TYPE OF SENATE RACE  
 880052 FORM TYPE  
 880053 REFUSAL CONVERSION INDICATOR  
 880054 PERSUASION LETTER REQUESTED  
 880055 FINAL CALL NUMBER  
 880056 FINAL RESULT CODE  
 880057 CHECKPOINT: R'S PHONE NUMBER/PHONE STATUS DIFFERENT  
 880058 PHONE NUMBER OBTAINED  
 880059 IS R'S NUMBER LISTED IN THE PHONE DIRECTORY  
 880060 IS PHONE LISTED IN R'S NAME  
 880061 IS THERE A REASON THAT WE SHOULD NOT INTERVIEW R  
 BY TELEPHONE  
 880062 INTERVIEWER'S INTERVIEW NUMBER  
 880063 DATE COMPLETED - MONTH  
 880064 DATE COMPLETED - DAY  
 880065 LENGTH OF INTERVIEW  
 880066 LENGTH OF PRE-EDITING  
 880067 LENGTH OF POST-EDITING  
 880068 BEGINNING TIME - LOCAL

880069 DID R REFUSE INTERVIEW INITIALLY  
 880070 DID R BREAK ANY APPOINTMENTS

#### R'S RESISTANCE TO INTERVIEW

880071 WAS THERE RESISTANCE TO THE INTERVIEW FROM R  
 880072 NOT INTERESTED, DOESN'T VOTE  
 880073 SURVEYS WASTE OF TIME, PREVIOUS BAD EXPERIENCE  
 880074 VERY ILL  
 880075 "TOO BUSY"  
 880076 STRESSFUL FAMILY SITUATION  
 880077 CONFIDENTIALITY  
 880078 FIRST INTERVIEW TOO LONG  
 880079 DIDN'T LIKE FIRST INTERVIEW  
 880080 DIDN'T LIKE FIRST INTERVIEWER  
 880081 NO REASON GIVEN  
 880082 OTHER REASON GIVEN FOR R'S RESISTANCE  
 880083 WAS R SUSPICIOUS  
 880084 WAS R HOSTILE  
  
 880085 WAS R RUDE  
 880086 WAS R THREATENING  
 880087 IF NON-INTERVIEW, WAS R POLITE BUT FIRM  
 880088 OTHER RESISTANCE REASON  
 880089 WAS THANK YOU LETTER SENT TO R

#### HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

880090 NUMBER OF PERSONS IN HOUSEHOLD  
 880091 NUMBER OF ELIGIBLE ADULTS  
 880092 NUMBER OF CHILDREN UNDER SIX YEARS OLD  
 880093 NUMBER OF CHILDREN SIX TO NINE YEARS OLD  
 880094 NUMBER OF CHILDREN TEN TO THIRTEEN YEARS OLD  
 880095 NUMBER OF CHILDREN FOURTEEN TO SEVENTEEN YEARS OLD  
 880096 HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

#### R'S INTEREST IN AND PREDICTIONS FOR CAMPAIGN

880097 R'S INTEREST IN THE CAMPAIGN  
 880098 R'S PREDICTION OF WINNER IN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION  
 880099 DOES R THINK PRESIDENTIAL RACE WILL BE CLOSE  
 880100 WHICH PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE DOES R THINK WILL  
 CARRY R'S STATE  
 880101 DOES R THINK THE PRESIDENTIAL RACE WILL BE CLOSE IN  
 R'S STATE  
 880102 DOES R CARE WHICH PARTY WINS THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

#### BUSH AS CANDIDATE

880103 IS THERE ANYTHING ABOUT BUSH THAT WOULD MAKE R VOTE  
 FOR HIM  
 880104 REASONS R WOULD VOTE FOR BUSH - FIRST MENTION  
 880105 REASONS R WOULD VOTE FOR BUSH - SECOND MENTION  
 880106 REASONS R WOULD VOTE FOR BUSH - THIRD MENTION  
 880107 REASONS R WOULD VOTE FOR BUSH - FOURTH MENTION  
 880108 REASONS R WOULD VOTE FOR BUSH - FIFTH MENTION  
 880109 IS THERE ANYTHING ABOUT BUSH THAT WOULD MAKE R VOTE



## AGAINST HIM

880110 REASONS R WOULD VOTE AGAINST BUSH - FIRST MENTION  
 880111 REASONS R WOULD VOTE AGAINST BUSH - SECOND MENTION  
 880112 REASONS R WOULD VOTE AGAINST BUSH - THIRD MENTION  
 880113 REASONS R WOULD VOTE AGAINST BUSH - FOURTH MENTION  
 880114 REASONS R WOULD VOTE AGAINST BUSH - FIFTH MENTION

## DUKAKIS AS CANDIDATE

880115 IS THERE ANYTHING ABOUT DUKAKIS THAT WOULD MAKE R  
 VOTE FOR HIM  
 880116 REASONS R WOULD VOTE FOR DUKAKIS - FIRST MENTION  
 880117 REASONS R WOULD VOTE FOR DUKAKIS - SECOND MENTION  
 880118 REASONS R WOULD VOTE FOR DUKAKIS - THIRD MENTION  
 880119 REASONS R WOULD VOTE FOR DUKAKIS - FOURTH MENTION  
 880120 REASONS R WOULD VOTE FOR DUKAKIS - FIFTH MENTION  
 880121 IS THERE ANYTHING ABOUT DUKAKIS THAT WOULD MAKE R  
 VOTE AGAINST HIM  
 880122 REASONS R WOULD VOTE AGAINST DUKAKIS - FIRST MENTION  
 880123 REASONS R WOULD VOTE AGAINST DUKAKIS - SECOND MENTION  
 880124 REASONS R WOULD VOTE AGAINST DUKAKIS - THIRD MENTION  
 880125 REASONS R WOULD VOTE AGAINST DUKAKIS - FOURTH MENTION  
 880126 REASONS R WOULD VOTE AGAINST DUKAKIS - FIFTH MENTION

## R'S ATTENTION TO CAMPAIGN/MEDIA

880127 HOW OFTEN DID R DISCUSS POLITICS IN THE PAST WEEK  
 880128 HOW OFTEN DID R WATCH NEWS ON TV IN THE PAST WEEK  
 880129 HOW MUCH ATTENTION DID R GIVE TO THE PRESIDENTIAL  
 880129 CAMPAIGN NEWS ON TV  
 880130 HOW OFTEN DID R READ A DAILY NEWSPAPER IN THE  
 PAST WEEK  
 880131 WHICH PAPER DID R READ - FIRST MENTION  
 880132 WHICH PAPER DID R READ - SECOND MENTION  
 880133 WHICH PAPER DID R READ - THIRD MENTION  
 880134 DID R READ ABOUT THE CAMPAIGN IN ANY NEWSPAPER  
 880135 HOW MUCH ATTENTION DID R GIVE TO THE PRESIDENTIAL  
 CAMPAIGN NEWS IN THE NEWSPAPER  
 880136 DID R READ ABOUT THE CAMPAIGN IN ANY MAGAZINES  
 880137 HOW MUCH ATTENTION DID R GIVE TO THE PRESIDENTIAL  
 CAMPAIGN NEWS IN MAGAZINES  
 880138 DID R LISTEN TO CAMPAIGN SPEECHES OR DISCUSSIONS  
 ON THE RADIO  
 880139 HOW MANY CAMPAIGN SPEECHES/DISCUSSIONS ON THE RADIO  
 DID R LISTEN TO

## R'S ASSESSMENT OF REAGAN AS PRESIDENT (PRE-ELECTION)

880140 R APPROVES/DISAPPROVES OF REAGAN'S HANDLING OF  
 HIS JOB AS PRESIDENT  
 880141 HOW STRONGLY DOES R APPROVE/DISAPPROVE OF REAGAN'S  
 HANDLING OF HIS JOB

## REPUBLICAN/DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES

880142 WHICH REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE DOES R  
THINK WOULD MAKE THE BEST PRESIDENT  
880143 DOES R THINK BUSH WOULD MAKE A BETTER PRESIDENT  
THAN ANY OTHER REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE  
880144 DOES R THINK REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE NAMED IN Q. D1  
WOULD MAKE A BETTER PRESIDENT THAN BUSH  
880145 WHICH DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE DOES R THINK WOULD  
MAKE THE BEST PRESIDENT  
880146 DOES R THINK DUKAKIS WOULD MAKE A BETTER  
PRESIDENT THAN ANY OTHER DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE  
880147 DOES R THINK THE DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE NAMED IN  
Q. D2 WOULD MAKE A BETTER PRESIDENT THAN DUKAKIS

#### R'S PARTICIPATION IN PRIMARY/CAUCUS

880148 DID R VOTE IN CAUCUS/PRIMARY ELECTION  
880149 DID R VOTE IN REPUBLICAN OR DEMOCRATIC  
PRIMARY/CAUCUS  
880150 WHICH REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE DID R VOTE FOR IN  
STATE CAUCUS/PRIMARY  
880151 WHICH DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE DID R VOTE FOR IN  
STATE PRIMARY/CAUCUS

#### FEELING THERMOMETERS - POLITICAL FIGURES

880152 FEELING THERMOMETER - ROBERT DOLE  
880153 FEELING THERMOMETER - MARIO CUOMO  
880154 FEELING THERMOMETER - GEORGE BUSH  
880155 FEELING THERMOMETER - MICHAEL DUKAKIS  
880156 FEELING THERMOMETER - PAT ROBERTSON  
880157 FEELING THERMOMETER - TED KENNEDY  
880158 FEELING THERMOMETER - RONALD REAGAN  
880159 FEELING THERMOMETER - LLOYD BENTSEN  
880160 FEELING THERMOMETER - DAN QUAYLE  
880161 FEELING THERMOMETER - MIKHAIL GORBACHEV  
880162 FEELING THERMOMETER - JESSE JACKSON  
880163 FEELING THERMOMETER - OLIVER NORTH  
880164 FEELING THERMOMETER - DEMOCRATIC PARTY  
880165 FEELING THERMOMETER - REPUBLICAN PARTY

#### PROBE INDICATORS FOR PRE-ELECTION SECTION D

880166 WAS QUESTION D1 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
880167 WAS QUESTION D2 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
880168 WAS QUESTION D4A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
880169 WAS QUESTION D4B PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
880170 WAS QUESTION D4C PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
880171 WAS QUESTION D4D PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
880172 WAS QUESTION D4E PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
880173 WAS QUESTION D4F PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
880174 WAS QUESTION D4G PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
880175 WAS QUESTION D4H PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
880176 WAS QUESTION D4J PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
880177 WAS QUESTION D4K PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
880178 WAS QUESTION D4M PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
880179 WAS QUESTION D4N PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880180 WAS QUESTION D5A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880181 WAS QUESTION D5B PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

WHAT R LIKES/DISLIKES ABOUT DEMOCRATIC PARTY

880182 WHETHER R LIKES ANYTHING ABOUT THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY  
 880183 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY-FIRST MENTION  
 880184 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY-SECOND MENTION  
 880185 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY-THIRD MENTION  
 880186 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY-FOURTH MENTION  
 880187 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY-FIFTH MENTION  
 880188 WHETHER R DISLIKES ANYTHING ABOUT THE DEMOCRATIC  
 PARTY  
 880189 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY-FIRST  
 MENTION  
 880190 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY-SECOND  
 MENTION  
 880191 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY-THIRD  
 MENTION  
 880192 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY-FOURTH  
 MENTION  
 880193 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY-FIFTH  
 MENTION

WHAT R LIKES/DISLIKES ABOUT REPUBLICAN PARTY

880194 WHETHER R LIKES ANYTHING ABOUT THE REPUBLICAN PARTY  
 880195 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT THE REPUBLICAN PARTY-FIRST MENTION  
 880196 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT THE REPUBLICAN PARTY-SECOND MENTION  
 880197 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT THE REPUBLICAN PARTY-THIRD MENTION  
 880198 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT THE REPUBLICAN PARTY-FOURTH MENTION  
 880199 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT THE REPUBLICAN PARTY-FIFTH MENTION  
 880200 WHETHER R DISLIKES ANYTHING ABOUT THE REPUBLICAN  
 PARTY  
 880201 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT THE REPUBLICAN PARTY-FIRST  
 MENTION  
 880202 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT THE REPUBLICAN PARTY-SECOND  
 MENTION  
 880203 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT THE REPUBLICAN PARTY-THIRD  
 MENTION  
 880204 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT THE REPUBLICAN PARTY-FOURTH  
 MENTION  
 880205 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT REPUBLICAN PARTY-FIFTH  
 MENTION

R'S PERSONAL FINANCIAL SITUATION

880206 DOES R FEEL BETTER/WORSE OFF FINANCIALLY THAN A  
 YEAR AGO  
 880207 HOW MUCH BETTER/WORSE OFF DOES R FEEL  
 880208 WILL R BE BETTER/WORSE OFF FINANCIALLY A YEAR FROM  
 NOW  
 880209 WILL R BE MUCH OR SOMEWHAT BETTER/WORSE OFF A YEAR  
 FROM NOW  
 880210 HAS R'S INCOME STAYED AT/ABOVE/BELOW THE COST OF  
 LIVING  
 880211 HOW MUCH HAS R'S INCOME RISEN ABOVE/FALLEN BEHIND

THE COST OF LIVING  
 880212 HAS FEDERAL ECONOMIC POLICY MADE A DIFFERENCE ON R'S  
 FINANCIAL POSITION  
 880213 HOW MUCH BETTER/WORSE HAS IT MADE R

R'S FEELINGS ABOUT CANDIDATE: BUSH

880214 WHETHER BUSH MAKES R ANGRY  
 880215 WHETHER BUSH MAKES R HOPEFUL  
 880216 WHETHER BUSH MAKES R AFRAID OF HIM  
 880217 WHETHER BUSH MAKES R PROUD

R'S FEELINGS ABOUT CANDIDATE: DUKAKIS

880218 WHETHER DUKAKIS MAKES R ANGRY  
 880219 WHETHER DUKAKIS MAKES R HOPEFUL  
 880220 WHETHER DUKAKIS MAKES R AFRAID OF HIM  
 880221 WHETHER DUKAKIS MAKES R PROUD

R'S FEELINGS ABOUT CANDIDATE: JACKSON

880222 WHETHER JACKSON MAKES R ANGRY  
 880223 WHETHER JACKSON MAKES R HOPEFUL  
 880224 WHETHER JACKSON MAKES R AFRAID OF HIM  
 880225 WHETHER JACKSON MAKES R PROUD

R'S ASSESSMENT OF REAGAN'S HANDLING OF ECONOMY  
 (PRE-ELECTION)

880226 R APPROVES/DISAPPROVES OF REAGAN'S HANDLING OF  
 THE ECONOMY  
 880227 HOW STRONGLY DOES R APPROVE/DISAPPROVE OF REAGAN'S  
 HANDLING OF THE ECONOMY

POSITIONS ON LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE SCALE

880228 LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE SCALE-R  
 880229 IF R HAD TO CHOOSE, WOULD R CONSIDER SELF A LIBERAL/  
 CONSERVATIVE  
 880230 SUMMARY: R'S LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE PLACEMENT  
 880231 LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE SCALE-DUKAKIS  
 880232 LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE SCALE-BUSH  
 880233 LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE SCALE-JACKSON  
 880234 LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE SCALE-REPUBLICAN PARTY  
 880235 LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE SCALE-DEMOCRATIC PARTY  
 880236 LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE SCALE-REAGAN  
 880237 LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE SCALE-FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

R'S OPINION ON NATIONAL/STATE ECONOMIC CONDITIONS  
 IN THE PAST YEAR

880238 HOW DOES R FEEL THE COUNTRY IS DOING  
 880239 DOES R THINK UNEMPLOYMENT HAS GOTTEN BETTER/  
 WORSE/STAYED THE SAME IN THE PAST YEAR  
 880240 HOW MUCH BETTER/WORSE IS UNEMPLOYMENT

880241 DOES R THINK THAT INFLATION HAS GOTTEN BETTER/  
WORSE/STAYED THE SAME IN THE PAST YEAR  
880242 HOW MUCH BETTER/WORSE IS INFLATION  
880243 DOES R THINK THE NATION'S ECONOMY HAS GOTTEN BETTER/  
WORSE/STAYED THE SAME IN THE PAST YEAR  
880244 HOW MUCH BETTER/WORSE IS THE NATION'S ECONOMY  
880245 DOES R THINK FEDERAL ECONOMIC POLICY HAS MADE THE  
ECONOMY BETTER/WORSE/NOT MADE MUCH DIFFERENCE  
880246 HOW MUCH BETTER/WORSE HAS FEDERAL POLICY MADE THE  
ECONOMY  
880247 DOES R SEE THE ECONOMY GETTING BETTER/WORSE/STAYING  
ABOUT THE SAME IN THE NEXT YEAR  
880248 DOES R FEEL THE BUDGET DEFICIT IS A VERY/SOMEWHAT/NOT  
SERIOUS PROBLEM  
880249 WOULD R PAY MORE TAXES TO REDUCE THE BUDGET DEFICIT  
880250 DOES R THINK THE STATE'S ECONOMY HAS GOTTEN BETTER/  
WORSE/STAYED THE SAME IN THE PAST YEAR  
880251 HOW MUCH BETTER/WORSE IS THE STATE ECONOMY

R'S OPINIONS ON FOREIGN RELATIONS - PAST YEAR

880252 DOES R THINK THE UNITED STATES' POSITION HAS GROWN  
STRONGER/WEAKER/STAYED THE SAME IN THE PAST YEAR  
880253 DOES R THINK THE REPUBLICANS/DEMOCRATS COULD BETTER  
KEEP THE U.S. OUT OF WAR IN THE NEXT FOUR YEARS  
880254 DOES R AGREE/DISAGREE U.S. SHOULD STAY OUT OF  
PROBLEMS IN OTHER PARTS OF THE WORLD

880R'S ASSESSMENT OF REAGAN'S HANDLING OF FOREIGN RELATIONS  
(PRE-ELECTION)

880255 R APPROVES/DISAPPROVES OF REAGAN'S HANDLING OF  
FOREIGN RELATIONS  
880256 HOW STRONGLY DOES R APPROVE/DISAPPROVE OF REAGAN'S  
HANDLING OF FOREIGN RELATIONS

PROBE INDICATORS FOR PRE-ELECTION SECTIONS G AND H

880257 WAS QUESTION G1A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
880258 WAS QUESTION G1B PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
880259 WAS QUESTION G1C PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
880260 WAS QUESTION G1D PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
880261 WAS QUESTION G2A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
880262 WAS QUESTION G2B PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
880263 WAS QUESTION G2C PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
880264 WAS QUESTION G2D PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
880265 WAS QUESTION G3A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
880266 WAS QUESTION G3B PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
880267 WAS QUESTION G3C PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
880268 WAS QUESTION G3D PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
880269 WAS QUESTION H7 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
880270 WAS QUESTION H8 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

R'S PARTY IDENTIFICATION

880271 R'S PARTY IDENTIFICATION  
880272 STRENGTH OF R'S PARTY IDENTIFICATION

880273 R CLOSER TO REPUBLICAN/DEMOCRATIC PARTY  
 880274 SUMMARY: R'S PARTY IDENTIFICATION

QUALITIES DESCRIBING CANDIDATE: BUSH

880275 HOW WELL DOES "INTELLIGENT" DESCRIBE BUSH  
 880276 HOW WELL DOES "COMPASSIONATE" DESCRIBE BUSH  
 880277 HOW WELL DOES "MORAL" DESCRIBE BUSH  
 880278 HOW WELL DOES "INSPIRING" DESCRIBE BUSH  
 880279 HOW WELL DOES "PROVIDES STRONG LEADERSHIP" DESCRIBE  
 BUSH  
 880280 HOW WELL DOES "DECENT" DESCRIBE BUSH  
 880281 HOW WELL DOES "REALLY CARES ABOUT PEOPLE LIKE YOU"  
 DESCRIBE BUSH  
 880282 HOW WELL DOES "KNOWLEDGEABLE" DESCRIBE BUSH  
 880283 HOW WELL DOES "HONEST" DESCRIBE BUSH

QUALITIES DESCRIBING CANDIDATE: DUKAKIS

880284 HOW WELL DOES "INTELLIGENT" DESCRIBE DUKAKIS  
 880285 HOW WELL DOES "COMPASSIONATE" DESCRIBE DUKAKIS  
 880286 HOW WELL DOES "MORAL" DESCRIBE DUKAKIS  
 880287 HOW WELL DOES "INSPIRING" DESCRIBE DUKAKIS  
 880288 HOW WELL DOES "PROVIDES STRONG LEADERSHIP"  
 DESCRIBE DUKAKIS  
 880289 HOW WELL DOES "DECENT" DESCRIBE DUKAKIS  
 880290 HOW WELL DOES "REALLY CARES ABOUT PEOPLE LIKE YOU"  
 DESCRIBE DUKAKIS  
 880291 HOW WELL DOES "KNOWLEDGEABLE" DESCRIBE DUKAKIS  
 880292 HOW WELL DOES "HONEST" DESCRIBE DUKAKIS

QUALITIES DESCRIBING CANDIDATE: JACKSON

880293 HOW WELL DOES "INTELLIGENT" DESCRIBE JACKSON  
 880294 HOW WELL DOES "COMPASSIONATE" DESCRIBE JACKSON  
 880295 HOW WELL DOES "MORAL" DESCRIBE JACKSON  
 880296 HOW WELL DOES "INSPIRING" DESCRIBE JACKSON  
 880297 HOW WELL DOES "PROVIDES STRONG LEADERSHIP" DESCRIBE  
 JACKSON  
 880298 HOW WELL DOES "DECENT" DESCRIBE JACKSON  
 880299 HOW WELL DOES "REALLY CARES ABOUT PEOPLE LIKE YOU"  
 DESCRIBE JACKSON  
 880300 HOW WELL DOES "KNOWLEDGEABLE" DESCRIBE JACKSON  
 880301 HOW WELL DOES "HONEST" DESCRIBE JACKSON

POSITION ON MORE/LESS GOVT SERVICES/SPENDING SCALE

880302 GOVERNMENT SERVICES/SPENDING SCALE-R  
 880303 GOVERNMENT SERVICES/SPENDING SCALE-DUKAKIS  
 880304 GOVERNMENT SERVICES/SPENDING SCALE-BUSH  
 880305 GOVERNMENT SERVICES/SPENDING SCALE-JACKSON  
 880306 GOVERNMENT SERVICES/SPENDING SCALE-FEDERAL  
 GOVERNMENT  
 880307 GOVERNMENT SERVICES/SPENDING SCALE-REPUBLICAN  
 PARTY  
 880308 GOVERNMENT SERVICES/SPENDING SCALE-DEMOCRATIC

## PARTY

880309 GOVERNMENT SERVICES/SPENDING SCALE-REAGAN

## POSITION ON MORE/LESS DEFENSE SPENDING SCALE

880310 DEFENSE SPENDING SCALE-R  
 880311 DEFENSE SPENDING SCALE-DUKAKIS  
 880312 DEFENSE SPENDING SCALE-BUSH  
 880313 DEFENSE SPENDING SCALE-JACKSON  
 880314 DEFENSE SPENDING SCALE-FEDERAL GOVERNMENT  
 880315 DEFENSE SPENDING SCALE-REPUBLICAN PARTY  
 880316 DEFENSE SPENDING SCALE-DEMOCRATIC PARTY  
 880317 DEFENSE SPENDING SCALE-REAGAN

## POSITION ON GOVT-FUNDED INSURANCE SCALE

880318 GOVERNMENT-FUNDED INSURANCE SCALE-R  
 880319 GOVERNMENT-FUNDED INSURANCE SCALE-DUKAKIS  
 880320 GOVERNMENT-FUNDED INSURANCE SCALE-BUSH  
 880321 GOVERNMENT-FUNDED INSURANCE SCALE-REPUBLICAN  
 PARTY  
 880322 GOVERNMENT-FUNDED INSURANCE SCALE-DEMOCRATIC  
 PARTY

## POSITION ON GOVT GUARANTEED LIVING/JOB SCALE

880323 GUARANTEED STDRD OF LIVING/JOB SCALE-R  
 880324 GUARANTEED STDRD OF LIVING/JOB SCALE-DUKAKIS  
 880325 GUARANTEED STDRD OF LIVING/JOB SCALE-BUSH  
 880326 GUARANTEED STDRD OF LIVING/JOB SCALE-JACKSON  
 880327 GUARANTEED STDRD OF LIVING/JOB SCALE-FEDERAL  
 GOVERNMENT  
 880328 GUARANTEED STDRD OF LIVING/JOB SCALE-REPUBLICAN  
 PARTY  
 880329 GUARANTEED STDRD OF LIVING/JOB SCALE-DEMOCRATIC  
 PARTY  
 880330 GUARANTEED STDRD OF LIVING/JOB SCALE-REAGAN  
 880331 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: FORM A OR B

## POSITION ON IMPROVING SOC/ECON STATUS OF BLACKS SCALE

880332 SOCIAL/ECONOMIC STATUS OF BLACKS SCALE-R  
 880333 SOCIAL/ECONOMIC STATUS OF BLACKS SCALE-DUKAKIS  
 880334 SOCIAL/ECONOMIC STATUS OF BLACKS SCALE-BUSH  
 880335 SOCIAL/ECONOMIC STATUS OF BLACKS SCALE-JACKSON  
 880336 SOCIAL ECONOMIC STATUS OF BLACKS SCALE-FEDERAL  
 GOVERNMENT  
 880337 SOCIAL ECONOMIC STATUS OF BLACKS SCALE-REPUBLICAN  
 PARTY  
 880338 SOCIAL/ECONOMIC STATUS OF BLACKS SCALE-DEMOCRATIC  
 PARTY  
 880339 SOCIAL/ECONOMIC STATUS OF BLACKS SCALE-REAGAN

## POSITION ON IMPROVING SOC/ECON STATUS OF MINORITIES SCALE

880340 SOCIAL/ECONOMIC STATUS OF MINORITIES SCALE-R  
 880341 SOCIAL/ECONOMIC STATUS OF MINORITIES SCALE-DUKAKIS  
 880342 SOCIAL/ECONOMIC STATUS OF MINORITIES SCALE-BUSH  
 880343 SOCIAL/ECONOMIC STATUS OF MINORITIES SCALE-JACKSON  
 880344 SOCIAL/ECONOMIC STATUS OF MINORITIES SCALE-FEDERAL  
 GOVERNMENT  
 880345 SOCIAL/ECONOMIC STATUS OF MINORITIES SCALE-  
 REPUBLICAN PARTY  
 880346 SOCIAL/ECONOMIC STATUS OF MINORITIES SCALE-  
 DEMOCRATIC PARTY  
 880347 SOCIAL/ECONOMIC STATUS OF MINORITIES SCALE-REAGAN

INCREASE/DECREASE SPENDING ON FEDERAL BUDGET PROGRAMS  
 (SEE ALSO VARIABLES 377-386)

880348 INCREASE/DECREASE SPENDING ON SOCIAL SECURITY  
 880349 INCREASE/DECREASE SPENDING ON FOOD STAMPS  
 880350 INCREASE/DECREASE SPENDING ON AID TO CONTRAS  
 880351 INCREASE/DECREASE SPENDING ON STAR WARS  
 880352 INCREASE/DECREASE SPENDING ON FIGHTING THE DISEASE  
 AIDS

DEMOCRATS/REPUBLICANS CUT SOC SECURITY/RAISE TAXES

880353 WHICH PARTY IS MORE LIKELY TO CUT SOCIAL SECURITY  
 880354 WHICH PARTY IS MORE LIKELY TO RAISE TAXES

PROBE INDICATORS FOR PRE-ELECTION SECTION L

880355 WAS QUESTION L8A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880356 WAS QUESTION L8B PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880357 WAS QUESTION L8C PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880358 WAS QUESTION L8D PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880359 WAS QUESTION L8E PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880360 WAS QUESTION L9 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880361 WAS QUESTION L10 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

R'S OPINION ON CHANCES OF GETTING IN WAR

880362 DOES R THINK CHANCES OF GETTING INTO A WAR HAVE  
 INCREASED/DECREASED/HAVEN'T CHANGED  
 880363 HOW MUCH HAVE CHANCES INCREASED/DECREASED

R'S OPINION ON U.S.-SOVIET ARMS AGREEMENTS

880364 R APPROVES/DISAPPROVES OF U.S.-SOVIET ARMS AGREEMENTS  
 880365 HOW STRONGLY DOES R APPROVE/DISAPPROVE

R'S OPINION ON U.S. MILITARY IN MIDDLE EAST

880366 R FAVORS/OPPOSES AMERICAN MILITARY FORCES IN THE  
 MIDDLE EAST TO PROTECT OIL SHIPMENTS  
 880367 HOW STRONGLY DOES R FAVOR/OPPOSE



## POSITION ON COOPERATION WITH RUSSIA SCALE

880368 COOPERATION WITH RUSSIA SCALE-R  
 880369 COOPERATION WITH RUSSIA SCALE-DUKAKIS  
 880370 COOPERATION WITH RUSSIA SCALE-BUSH  
 880371 COOPERATION WITH RUSSIA SCALE-JACKSON  
 880372 COOPERATION WITH RUSSIA SCALE-FEDERAL GOVERNMENT  
 880373 COOPERATION WITH RUSSIA SCALE-REPUBLICAN PARTY  
 880374 COOPERATION WITH RUSSIA SCALE-DEMOCRATIC PARTY  
 880375 COOPERATION WITH RUSSIA SCALE-REAGAN

## R'S OPINION ON LIMITS ON IMPORTS

880376 R FAVORS/OPPOSES LIMITS ON FOREIGN IMPORTS

INCREASE/DECREASE SPENDING ON FEDERAL BUDGET PROGRAMS  
 (SEE ALSO VARIABLES 348-352)

880377 INCREASE/DECREASE SPENDING ON PROTECTION OF THE ENVIRONMENT  
 880378 INCREASE/DECREASE SPENDING ON FINANCIAL AID FOR COLLEGE STUDENTS  
 880379 INCREASE/DECREASE SPENDING ON ASSISTANCE FOR THE UNEMPLOYED  
 880380 INCREASE/DECREASE SPENDING ON SPACE AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH  
 880381 INCREASE/DECREASE SPENDING ON PROGRAMS THAT ASSIST BLACKS  
 880382 INCREASE/DECREASE SPENDING ON CHILDCARE  
 880383 INCREASE/DECREASE SPENDING ON PUBLIC SCHOOLS  
 880384 INCREASE/DECREASE SPENDING ON CARE FOR THE ELDERLY  
 880385 INCREASE/DECREASE SPENDING ON THE HOMELESS  
 880386 INCREASE/DECREASE SPENDING FOR THE WAR ON DRUGS

## POSITION ON WOMEN'S RIGHTS SCALE

880387 WOMEN'S RIGHTS SCALE-R  
 880388 WOMEN'S RIGHTS SCALE-DUKAKIS  
 880389 WOMEN'S RIGHTS SCALE-BUSH  
 880390 WOMEN'S RIGHTS SCALE-REPUBLICAN PARTY  
 880391 WOMEN'S RIGHTS SCALE-DEMOCRATIC PARTY  
 880392 WOMEN'S RIGHTS SCALE-REAGAN

## R'S OPINIONS ON DRUG PROBLEM

880393 HOW IMPORTANT IS THE DRUG PROBLEM IN THE U.S.  
 880394 WILL BUSH/DUKAKIS DO BETTER JOB OF SOLVING THIS PROBLEM

## R'S OPINION ON ABORTION

880395 R'S POSITION ON ABORTION

## R'S OPINION ON PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION (PRE-ELECTION)

880396 DOES R EXPECT TO VOTE IN NOVEMBER  
 880397 WHO WILL R VOTE FOR IN THE ELECTION FOR PRESIDENT  
 880398 HOW STRONG IS R'S PREFERENCE FOR PRESIDENTIAL  
 CANDIDATE

880399 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: FORM A OR B

## PROBE INDICATORS FOR PRE-ELECTION SECTION N

880400 WAS QUESTION N1A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880401 WAS QUESTION N1B PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880402 WAS QUESTION N1C PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880403 WAS QUESTION N1D PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880404 WAS QUESTION N1E PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880405 WAS QUESTION N1F PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880406 WAS QUESTION N1G PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880407 WAS QUESTION N1H PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880408 WAS QUESTION N1J PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880409 WAS QUESTION N1K PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880410 WAS QUESTION N3 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880411 WAS QUESTION N3A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

## PERSONAL INFORMATION ABOUT R

880412 R'S RACE  
 880413 R'S SEX  
 880414 R'S AGE  
 880415 R'S DATE OF BIRTH - MONTH  
 880416 R'S DATE OF BIRTH - YEAR  
 880417 R'S RECODED AGE  
 880418 R'S MARITAL STATUS

## R'S EDUCATION

880419 HIGHEST GRADE OF SCHOOL COMPLETED BY R  
 880420 DOES R HAVE A HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA  
 880421 R'S HIGHEST COLLEGE DEGREE  
 880422 SUMMARY: R'S EDUCATION  
 880423 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: R IS MARRIED OR LIVING  
 WITH PARTNER

## EDUCATION OF R'S SPOUSE

880424 HIGHEST GRADE OF SCHOOL COMPLETED BY SPOUSE  
 880425 DOES SPOUSE HAVE HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA  
 880426 SPOUSE'S HIGHEST COLLEGE DEGREE  
 880427 SUMMARY: SPOUSE'S EDUCATION

## R'S OCCUPATION SECTION

880428 R'S PRESENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS  
 880429 SUMMARY: R'S WORKING STATUS

880430 HAS R (UNEMPLOYED) EVER WORKED FOR PAY  
 880431 WHEN DID R RETIRE  
 880432 HAS R (DISABLED) EVER WORKED FOR PAY  
 880433 IS R (HOMEMAKER/STUDENT) WORKING NOW  
 880434 HAS R (HOMEMAKER/STUDENT) WORKED IN LAST SIX MONTHS

OCCUPATION - R WORKING OR TEMPORARILY LAID OFF

880435 R'S PRESENT OCCUPATION - CENSUS OCCUPATION CODE  
 880436 R'S PRESENT OCCUPATION - COLLAPSED CENSUS  
 OCCUPATION CODE  
 880437 R'S PRESENT OCCUPATION - CENSUS INDUSTRY CODE  
 880438 IS R SELF-EMPLOYED  
 880439 IS R EMPLOYED BY FEDERAL/STATE/LOCAL GOVERNMENT  
 880440 NUMBER OF HOURS PER WEEK R WORKS  
 880441 IS R SATISFIED WITH NUMBER OF HOURS WORKED  
 880442 HOW WORRIED IS R ABOUT JOB SECURITY  
  
 880443 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: IS R WORKING NOW  
  
 880444 WAS R OUT OF WORK WITHIN THE LAST SIX MONTHS  
 880445 HAS R HAD TO TAKE A PAY CUT/REDUCE HOURS WITHIN THE  
 LAST SIX MONTHS

OCCUPATION - R UNEMPLOYED, RETIRED OR DISABLED

880446 R'S LAST OCCUPATION - CENSUS OCCUPATION CODE  
 880447 R'S LAST OCCUPATION - COLLAPSED CENSUS OCCUPATION  
 CODE  
 880448 R'S LAST OCCUPATION - CENSUS INDUSTRY CODE  
 880449 ON R'S LAST REGULAR JOB, WAS R SELF-EMPLOYED  
 880450 WAS R EMPLOYED BY FEDERAL/STATE/LOCAL GOVERNMENT  
 880451 DID R WORK WITHIN THE LAST SIX MONTHS  
 880452 NUMBER OF HOURS PER WEEK R WORKED  
  
 880453 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: IS R UNEMPLOYED  
  
 880454 IS R DOING ANY WORK FOR PAY AT THE PRESENT TIME  
 880455 IS R LOOKING FOR WORK AT THE PRESENT TIME  
 880456 HOW WORRIED IS R ABOUT NOT BEING ABLE TO FIND A JOB

OCCUPATION - R HOMEMAKER OR STUDENT

880457 R'S LAST OCCUPATION - CENSUS OCCUPATION CODE  
 880458 R'S LAST OCCUPATION - COLLAPSED CENSUS OCCUPATION  
 CODE  
 880459 R'S LAST OCCUPATION - CENSUS INDUSTRY CODE  
 880460 WAS R SELF-EMPLOYED ON LAST JOB  
 880461 WAS R EMPLOYED BY FEDERAL/STATE/LOCAL GOVERNMENT  
 880462 NUMBER OF HOURS PER WEEK R WORKED ON LAST JOB  
 880463 IS R LOOKING FOR WORK AT THE PRESENT TIME  
 880464 HOW WORRIED IS R ABOUT NOT BEING ABLE TO FIND A JOB

R'S OCCUPATIONAL DATA - STACKED

880465 R'S PRESENT/LAST OCCUPATION - CENSUS OCCUPATION CODE  
 880466 R'S PRESENT/LAST OCCUPATION - COLLAPSED 1980 CODE

880467 R'S PRESENT/LAST OCCUPATION - CENSUS INDUSTRY CODE  
 880468 R SELF-EMPLOYED  
 880469 EMPLOYED BY FEDERAL, STATE OR LOCAL GOVERNMENT  
 880470 NUMBER OF HOURS WORKED PER WEEK  
 880471 IS R WORRIED ABOUT JOB SECURITY  
 880472 HAS R (UNEMPLOYED/RETIRED/DISABLED) HAD A JOB IN  
 THE PAST SIX MONTHS  
 880473 IS R (UNEMPLOYED/RETIRED/DISABLED) LOOKING FOR WORK  
 AT PRESENT TIME  
 880474 HAS R (UNEMPLOYED/DISABLED) EVER DONE ANY WORK FOR PAY  
 880475 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: R IS MALE AND MARRIED/  
 PARTNERED

WIFE/PARTNER OF R OCCUPATION

880476 IS R'S WIFE/PARTNER WORKING NOW  
 880477 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: IS R MARRIED AND FEMALE

HUSBAND/PARTNER OF R OCCUPATION SECTION

880478 HUSBAND/PARTNER'S PRESENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS  
 880479 SUMMARY: HUSBAND/PARTNER'S WORKING STATUS  
 880480 HAS HUSBAND/PARTNER (UNEMPLOYED) EVER DONE ANY WORK  
 FOR PAY  
 880481 WHEN DID HUSBAND/PARTNER RETIRE  
 880482 HAS HUSBAND/PARTNER (DISABLED) EVER DONE ANY WORK  
 FOR PAY  
 880483 IS HUSBAND/PARTNER (HOMEMAKER/STUDENT) DOING  
 ANY WORK FOR PAY AT THE PRESENT TIME  
 880484 HAS HUSBAND/PARTNER (HOMEMAKER/STUDENT) WORKED  
 FOR PAY IN THE LAST SIX MONTHS

OCCUPATION - HUSBAND WORKING OR TEMPORARILY LAID OFF

880485 HUSBAND/PARTNER'S PRESENT OCCUPATION - CENSUS  
 OCCUPATION CODE  
 880486 HUSBAND/PARTNER'S PRESENT OCCUPATION - COLLAPSED  
 CENSUS OCCUPATION CODE  
 880487 HUSBAND/PARTNER'S PRESENT OCCUPATION - CENSUS  
 INDUSTRY CODE  
 880488 IS HUSBAND/PARTNER SELF-EMPLOYED  
 880489 IS HUSBAND/PARTNER EMPLOYED BY FEDERAL/STATE/LOCAL  
 GOVERNMENT  
 880490 NUMBER OF HOURS PER WEEK HUSBAND/PARTNER WORKS  
 880491 IS HUSBAND/PARTNER SATISFIED WITH NUMBER OF HOURS  
 WORKED  
 880492 HOW WORRIED IS HUSBAND/PARTNER ABOUT JOB SECURITY  
 880493 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: IS HUSBAND/PARTNER WORKING  
 NOW  
 880494 WAS HUSBAND/PARTNER OUT OF WORK WITHIN THE LAST  
 SIX MONTHS  
 880495 HAS HUSBAND/PARTNER HAD TO TAKE A PAY CUT/REDUCE  
 HOURS WITHIN THE LAST SIX MONTHS

## OCCUPATION - HUSBAND UNEMPLOYED, RETIRED OR DISABLED

880496 HUSBAND/PARTNER'S LAST OCCUPATION - CENSUS  
OCCUPATION CODE

880497 HUSBAND/PARTNER'S LAST OCCUPATION - COLLAPSED  
CENSUS OCCUPATION CODE

880498 HUSBAND/PARTNER'S LAST OCCUPATION - CENSUS  
INDUSTRY CODE

880499 WAS HUSBAND/PARTNER SELF-EMPLOYED ON LAST JOB

880500 WAS HUSBAND/PARTNER EMPLOYED BY FEDERAL/STATE/LOCAL  
GOVERNMENT ON LAST JOB

880501 WAS HUSBAND/PARTNER EMPLOYED IN THE LAST SIX MONTHS

880502 NUMBER OF HOURS PER WEEK HUSBAND/PARTNER WORKED

880503 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: IS HUSBAND/PARTNER UNEMPLOYED

880504 IS HUSBAND/PARTNER DOING ANY WORK FOR PAY AT THE  
PRESENT TIME

880505 IS HUSBAND/PARTNER LOOKING FOR WORK AT THE PRESENT  
TIME

880506 HOW WORRIED IS HUSBAND/PARTNER ABOUT NOT BEING ABLE  
TO FIND A JOB

## HUSBAND/PARTNER OF R OCCUPATIONAL DATA - STACKED

880507 HUSBAND'S PRESENT/LAST OCCUPATION - CENSUS OCCUPATION  
CODE

880508 HUSBAND'S PRESENT/LAST OCCUPATION - COLLAPSED 1980  
CODE

880509 HUSBAND'S PRESENT/LAST OCCUPATION - CENSUS INDUSTRY  
CODE

880510 IS/WAS HUSBAND SELF-EMPLOYED

880511 IS/WAS HUSBAND EMPLOYED BY FEDERAL/STATE/LOCAL  
GOVERNMENT

880512 HUSBAND - NUMBER OF HOURS WORKED PER WEEK

880513 HUSBAND - WORRIED ABOUT JOB SECURITY

880514 HAS HUSBAND (UNEMPLOYED/RETIRED/DISABLED) HAD A JOB IN  
THE PAST SIX MONTHS

880515 IS HUSBAND (UNEMPLOYED/RETIRED/DISABLED) LOOKING FOR  
WORK AT THE PRESENT TIME

880516 HAS HUSBAND (UNEMPLOYED/DISABLED) EVER DONE ANY WORK  
FOR PAY

## LABOR UNION POSITION

880517 DOES ANYONE IN R'S HOUSEHOLD BELONG TO A LABOR UNION

880518 WHO BELONGS TO A LABOR UNION

880519 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: IS R ONLY FAMILY MEMBER AGE  
14 OR OLDER

## R'S FAMILY POSITION AND SOCIAL CLASS

880520 FAMILY/HOUSEHOLD INCOME BEFORE TAXES

880521 R'S INCOME BEFORE TAXES

880522 DOES R THINK OF SELF AS BELONGING TO A SOCIAL CLASS  
 880523 DOES R THINK OF SELF AS MIDDLE OR WORKING CLASS  
 880524 DOES R THINK OF SELF AS AVERAGE OR UPPER MIDDLE/  
 WORKING CLASS  
 880525 SUMMARY: R'S SOCIAL CLASS  
 880526 DOES R FEEL CLOSE TO MIDDLE/WORKING CLASS

R'S RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE AND PRACTICE

880527 R'S RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE AND DENOMINATION  
 880528 IS RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE MENTIONED BY R CHRISTIAN  
 880529 DOES R CONSIDER SELF A BORN-AGAIN CHRISTIAN  
 880530 HOW OFTEN DOES R ATTEND CHURCH/SYNAGOGUE  
 880531 DOES R ATTEND CHURCH/SYNAGOGUE ONCE A WEEK OR MORE  
 OFTEN  
 880532 DID R WATCH/LISTEN TO RELIGIOUS PROGRAMS ON TV/RADIO  
 DURING THE PAST WEEK  
 880533 HOW OFTEN DID R WATCH/LISTEN TO RELIGIOUS PROGRAMS

R'S ETHNIC IDENTITY

880534 WHAT DOES R CONSIDER HIS/HER MAIN ETHNIC GROUP  
 (OTHER THAN AMERICAN) - FIRST MENTION  
 880535 WHAT DOES R CONSIDER THEIR MAIN ETHNIC GROUP  
 (OTHER THAN AMERICAN) - SECOND MENTION  
 880536 NUMBER OF ETHNIC GROUPS R MENTIONED  
 880537 WITH WHICH GROUP DOES R MOST CLOSELY IDENTIFY  
 880538 WERE R'S PARENTS BORN IN THIS COUNTRY  
  
 880539 CHECKPOINT: DID R MENTION SOME HISPANIC GROUP  
  
 880540 IS R OF SPANISH OR HISPANIC ORIGIN/DESCENT  
 880541 CATEGORY THAT BEST DESCRIBES R'S HISPANIC ORIGIN

PERSONAL INFORMATION: R'S PARENTS

880542 R'S FATHER'S MAIN OCCUPATION - CENSUS OCCUPATION  
 CODE  
 880543 DID R'S MOTHER HAVE A JOB  
 880544 R'S MOTHER'S MAIN OCCUPATION - CENSUS OCCUPATION  
 CODE

PERSONAL INFORMATION: R'S COMMUNITY

880545 R'S BIRTHPLACE  
 880546 WHERE DID R GROW UP  
 880547 COMMUNITY TYPE R GREW UP IN  
 880548 HOW LONG HAS R LIVED IN PRESENT CITY/TOWN/TOWNSHIP/  
 COUNTY  
 880549 WHERE DID R LIVE BEFORE - CITY  
 880550 WHERE DID R LIVE BEFORE - STATE OR COUNTRY  
 880551 HOW LONG HAS R LIVED IN THIS HOUSE/APARTMENT  
 880552 DOES R/R'S FAMILY OWN OR RENT R'S HOME

CONDITIONS OF PRE-ELECTION INTERVIEW

880553 OTHERS PRESENT AT INTERVIEW  
 880554 R'S COOPERATION  
 880555 R'S LEVEL OF INFORMATION ABOUT POLITICS/PUBLIC  
 AFFAIRS  
 880556 R'S APPARENT INTELLIGENCE  
 880557 WAS R SUSPICIOUS BEFORE INTERVIEW  
 880558 R'S INTEREST IN THE INTERVIEW  
 880559 R'S SINCERITY  
 880560 DID R REPORT INCOME CORRECTLY  
 880561 INTERVIEWER'S ESTIMATE OF R'S FAMILY INCOME  
 880562 WAS INTERVIEW CONDUCTED IN ENGLISH  
 880563 LANGUAGE IN WHICH INTERVIEW WAS CONDUCTED (IF OTHER  
 THAN ENGLISH)

POST-ELECTION SURVEY

CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGN

880564 R'S INTEREST IN THE CAMPAIGN  
 880565 DOES R REMEMBER THE CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATES  
 880566 NUMBER OF CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATE - CANDIDATE 1  
 880567 FROM WHICH PARTY WAS THE CANDIDATE - CANDIDATE 1  
 880568 COLLAPSED CODE FOR CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATE 1  
 880569 R'S KNOWLEDGE OF CANDIDATE'S NAME AND PARTY -  
 CANDIDATE 1  
 880570 NUMBER OF CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATE - CANDIDATE 2  
 880571 FROM WHICH PARTY WAS THE CANDIDATE - CANDIDATE 2  
 880572 COLLAPSED CODE FOR CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATE 2  
 880573 R'S KNOWLEDGE OF CANDIDATE'S NAME AND PARTY -  
 CANDIDATE 2  
 880574 NUMBER OF CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATE - CANDIDATE 3  
 880575 FROM WHICH PARTY WAS THE CANDIDATE - CANDIDATE 3  
 880576 COLLAPSED CODE FOR CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATE 3  
 880577 R'S KNOWLEDGE OF CANDIDATE'S NAME AND PARTY -  
 CANDIDATE 3  
 880578 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: U.S. SENATE RACE IN STATE?

SENATE CAMPAIGN

880579 DOES R REMEMBER THE SENATE CANDIDATES  
 880580 NUMBER OF SENATE CANDIDATE - CANDIDATE 1  
 880581 FROM WHICH PARTY WAS THE CANDIDATE - CANDIDATE 1  
 880582 COLLAPSED CODE FOR SENATE CANDIDATE 1  
 880583 R'S KNOWLEDGE OF CANDIDATE'S NAME AND PARTY -  
 CANDIDATE 1  
 880584 NUMBER OF SENATE CANDIDATE - CANDIDATE 2  
 880585 FROM WHICH PARTY WAS THE CANDIDATE - CANDIDATE 2  
 880586 COLLAPSED CODE FOR SENATE CANDIDATE 2  
 880587 R'S KNOWLEDGE OF CANDIDATE'S NAME AND PARTY -  
 CANDIDATE 2  
 880588 NUMBER OF SENATE CANDIDATE - CANDIDATE 3  
 880589 FROM WHICH PARTY WAS THE CANDIDATE - CANDIDATE 3  
 880590 COLLAPSED CODE FOR SENATE CANDIDATE 3  
 880591 R'S KNOWLEDGE OF CANDIDATE'S NAME AND PARTY -  
 CANDIDATE 3

## FEELING THERMOMETER: POLITICAL FIGURES

880592 FEELING THERMOMETER - GEORGE BUSH  
 880593 FEELING THERMOMETER - MICHAEL DUKAKIS  
 880594 FEELING THERMOMETER - JESSE JACKSON  
 880595 FEELING THERMOMETER - JIMMY CARTER  
 880596 FEELING THERMOMETER - DEMOCRATIC U.S. SENATE  
 CANDIDATE  
 880597 FEELING THERMOMETER - REPUBLICAN U.S. SENATE  
 CANDIDATE  
  
 880598 FEELING THERMOMETER - U.S. SENATE INCUMBENT -  
 CANDIDATE 1 (TERM IS NOT UP)  
 880599 FEELING THERMOMETER - U.S. SENATE INCUMBENT -  
 CANDIDATE 2  
 880600 FEELING THERMOMETER - U.S. SENATE INCUMBENT -  
 CANDIDATE 3  
 880601 FEELING THERMOMETER - DEMOCRATIC HOUSE CANDIDATE  
 880602 FEELING THERMOMETER - REPUBLICAN HOUSE CANDIDATE  
 880603 FEELING THERMOMETER - INDEPENDENT/THIRD PARTY HOUSE  
 CANDIDATE

## FEELING THERMOMETER: GROUPS IN SOCIETY

880604 FEELING THERMOMETER - LABOR UNIONS  
 880605 FEELING THERMOMETER - FEMINISTS  
 880606 FEELING THERMOMETER - CIVIL RIGHTS LEADERS  
 880607 FEELING THERMOMETER - PEOPLE ON WELFARE  
 880608 FEELING THERMOMETER - WOMEN  
 880609 FEELING THERMOMETER - CONSERVATIVES  
 880610 FEELING THERMOMETER - POOR PEOPLE  
 880611 FEELING THERMOMETER - CATHOLICS  
 880612 FEELING THERMOMETER - BIG BUSINESS  
 880613 FEELING THERMOMETER - BLACKS  
 880614 FEELING THERMOMETER - EVANGELICAL GROUPS ACTIVE IN  
 POLITICS  
 880615 FEELING THERMOMETER - FEDERAL GOVERNMENT  
 880616 FEELING THERMOMETER - LIBERALS  
 880617 FEELING THERMOMETER - HISPANICS  
 880618 FEELING THERMOMETER - THE MILITARY  
 880619 FEELING THERMOMETER - THE ELDERLY  
 880620 FEELING THERMOMETER - ENVIRONMENTALISTS  
 880621 FEELING THERMOMETER - U.S. SUPREME COURT  
 880622 FEELING THERMOMETER - ILLEGAL ALIENS  
 880623 FEELING THERMOMETER - PALESTINIANS  
 880624 FEELING THERMOMETER - OPPONENTS OF ABORTION  
 880625 FEELING THERMOMETER - WHITES  
 880626 FEELING THERMOMETER - JEWS  
 880627 FEELING THERMOMETER - HOMOSEXUALS  
 880628 FEELING THERMOMETER - CONGRESS  
 880629 FEELING THERMOMETER - CHRISTIAN FUNDAMENTALISTS

## R'S VOTE - 1984

880630 DID R VOTE IN 1984 ELECTION  
 880631 WHO DID R VOTE FOR IN 1984 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION



## QUALITIES DESCRIBING CANDIDATES: BUSH/DUKAKIS

880632 HOW WELL DOES "TOUGH ON CRIME AND CRIMINALS"  
DESCRIBE GEORGE BUSH

880633 HOW WELL DOES "CARES ABOUT THE ENVIRONMENT"  
DESCRIBE GEORGE BUSH

880634 HOW WELL DOES "TOUGH ON CRIME AND CRIMINALS"

DESCRIBE MICHAEL DUKAKIS

880635 HOW WELL DOES "CARES ABOUT THE ENVIRONMENT"  
DESCRIBE MICHAEL DUKAKIS

## PROBE INDICATORS FOR POST-ELECTION SECTION B

880636 WAS QUESTION B1A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880637 WAS QUESTION B1B PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880638 WAS QUESTION B1C PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880639 WAS QUESTION B1D PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880640 WAS QUESTION B1E PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880641 WAS QUESTION B1F PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880642 WAS QUESTION B1G PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880643 WAS QUESTION B1H PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880644 WAS QUESTION B1J PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880645 WAS QUESTION B1K PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880646 WAS QUESTION B1M PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880647 WAS QUESTION B1N PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880648 WAS QUESTION B2A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880649 WAS QUESTION B2B PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880650 WAS QUESTION B2C PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880651 WAS QUESTION B2D PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880652 WAS QUESTION B2E PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880653 WAS QUESTION B2F PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880654 WAS QUESTION B2G PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880655 WAS QUESTION B2H PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880656 WAS QUESTION B2J PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880657 WAS QUESTION B2K PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880658 WAS QUESTION B2M PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880659 WAS QUESTION B2N PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880660 WAS QUESTION B2P PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880661 WAS QUESTION B2Q PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880662 WAS QUESTION B2R PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880663 WAS QUESTION B2S PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880664 WAS QUESTION B2T PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880665 WAS QUESTION B2U PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880666 WAS QUESTION B2V PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880667 WAS QUESTION B2W PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880668 WAS QUESTION B2X PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880669 WAS QUESTION B2Y PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880670 WAS QUESTION B2Z PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880671 WAS QUESTION B2AA PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880672 WAS QUESTION B2BB PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880673 WAS QUESTION B2CC PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

## R'S LIKES/DISLIKES ABOUT HOUSE CANDIDATE: DEMOCRATIC

880674 IS THERE ANYTHING R LIKES ABOUT DEMOCRATIC  
CANDIDATE FOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

880675 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT HOUSE DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE  
 - FIRST MENTION  
 880676 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT HOUSE DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE  
 - SECOND MENTION  
 880677 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT HOUSE DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE  
 - THIRD MENTION  
 880678 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT HOUSE DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE  
 - FOURTH MENTION  
 880679 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT HOUSE DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE  
 - FIFTH MENTION  
 880680 IS THERE ANYTHING R DISLIKES ABOUT DEMOCRATIC  
 CANDIDATE FOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
 880681 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT HOUSE DEMOCRATIC  
 CANDIDATE - FIRST MENTION  
 880682 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT HOUSE DEMOCRATIC  
 CANDIDATE - SECOND MENTION  
 880683 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT HOUSE DEMOCRATIC  
 CANDIDATE - THIRD MENTION  
 880684 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT HOUSE DEMOCRATIC  
 CANDIDATE - FOURTH MENTION  
 880685 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT HOUSE DEMOCRATIC  
 CANDIDATE - FIFTH MENTION

R'S LIKES/DISLIKES ABOUT HOUSE CANDIDATE: REPUBLICAN

880686 IS THERE ANYTHING R LIKES ABOUT REPUBLICAN  
 CANDIDATE FOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
 880687 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT HOUSE REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE  
 - FIRST MENTION  
 880688 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT HOUSE REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE  
 - SECOND MENTION  
 880689 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT HOUSE REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE  
 - THIRD MENTION  
 880690 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT HOUSE REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE  
 - FOURTH MENTION  
 880691 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT HOUSE REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE  
 - FIFTH MENTION  
 880692 IS THERE ANYTHING R DISLIKES ABOUT REPUBLICAN  
 CANDIDATE FOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
 880693 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT HOUSE REPUBLICAN  
 CANDIDATE - FIRST MENTION  
 880694 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT HOUSE REPUBLICAN  
 CANDIDATE - SECOND MENTION  
 880695 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT HOUSE REPUBLICAN  
 CANDIDATE - THIRD MENTION  
 880696 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT HOUSE REPUBLICAN  
 CANDIDATE - FOURTH MENTION  
 880697 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT HOUSE REPUBLICAN  
 CANDIDATE - FIFTH MENTION

IMPORTANT ISSUES - HOUSE CAMPAIGN

880698 IMPORTANT ISSUES TO R IN CAMPAIGN FOR HOUSE OF  
 REPRESENTATIVES - FIRST MENTION  
 880699 IMPORTANT ISSUES TO R IN CAMPAIGN FOR HOUSE OF  
 REPRESENTATIVES - SECOND MENTION  
 880700 IMPORTANT ISSUES TO R IN CAMPAIGN FOR HOUSE OF  
 REPRESENTATIVES - THIRD MENTION

880701 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: HAS R MENTIONED ISSUES

880702 ISSUE MOST IMPORTANT TO R IN CAMPAIGN

880703 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: TYPE OF RACE, ONE OR TWO CANDIDATES

880704 DID R PREFER ONE OF THE CANDIDATES BECAUSE OF THIS ISSUE

880705 CANDIDATE R PREFERRED

880706 PARTY OF CANDIDATE NAMED

880707 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: TYPE OF RACE, ONE OR TWO CANDIDATES

R'S KNOWLEDGE OF INCUMBENTS - HOUSE CAMPAIGN

880708 TWO HOUSE CANDIDATES RUNNING: WAS EITHER CANDIDATE ALREADY IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

880709 TWO HOUSE CANDIDATES RUNNING: WHICH CANDIDATE WAS ALREADY IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

880710 TWO HOUSE CANDIDATES RUNNING: PARTY OF CANDIDATE ALREADY IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

880711 ONE HOUSE CANDIDATE RUNNING: WAS CANDIDATE ALREADY IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

880712 ONE HOUSE CANDIDATE RUNNING: CANDIDATE NUMBER CODE

880713 ONE HOUSE CANDIDATE RUNNING: PARTY OF CANDIDATE

880714 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: DISTRICTS IN WHICH HOUSE INCUMBENT RAN

CONTACT WITH U.S. HOUSE INCUMBENT

880715 DID R HAVE ANY CONTACT WITH INCUMBENT

880716 DID R MEET INCUMBENT PERSONALLY

880717 DID R ATTEND MEETING/GATHERING WHERE INCUMBENT SPOKE

880718 DID R TALK WITH INCUMBENT'S STAFF/OFFICE

880719 DID R RECEIVE SOMETHING IN MAIL FROM INCUMBENT

880720 DID R READ ABOUT INCUMBENT IN NEWSPAPER/MAGAZINE

880721 DID R HEAR INCUMBENT ON RADIO

880722 DID R SEE INCUMBENT ON TELEVISION

880723 R HAD CONTACT WITH INCUMBENT IN OTHER WAYS

880724 DOES R KNOW ANYONE WHO HAD CONTACT WITH INCUMBENT

880725 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: DISTRICT IN WHICH HOUSE INCUMBENT HAD OPPOSITION

CONTACT WITH U.S. HOUSE CANDIDATE - DISTRICTS WITH RUNNING INCUMBENT

880726 DID R HAVE ANY CONTACT WITH CANDIDATE

880727 DID R MEET CANDIDATE PERSONALLY

880728 DID R ATTEND MEETING/GATHERING WHERE CANDIDATE SPOKE

880729 DID R TALK WITH CANDIDATE'S STAFF/OFFICE

880730 DID R RECEIVE SOMETHING IN MAIL FROM CANDIDATE

880731 DID R READ ABOUT CANDIDATE IN NEWSPAPER/MAGAZINE

880732 DID R HEAR CANDIDATE ON RADIO  
 880733 DID R SEE CANDIDATE ON TELEVISION  
 880734 R HAD CONTACT WITH CANDIDATE IN OTHER WAYS  
 880735 DOES R KNOW ANYONE WHO HAD CONTACT WITH CANDIDATE

CONTACT WITH U.S. HOUSE INCUMBENT - DISTRICTS WITH  
 NO INCUMBENT RUNNING

880736 DID R HAVE ANY CONTACT WITH CANDIDATE  
 880737 DID R MEET CANDIDATE PERSONALLY  
 880738 DID R ATTEND MEETING/GATHERING WHERE CANDIDATE SPOKE  
 880739 DID R TALK WITH CANDIDATE'S STAFF/OFFICE  
 880740 DID R RECEIVE SOMETHING IN MAIL FROM CANDIDATE  
 880741 DID R READ ABOUT CANDIDATE IN NEWSPAPER/MAGAZINE  
 880742 DID R HEAR CANDIDATE ON RADIO  
 880743 DID R SEE CANDIDATE ON TELEVISION  
 880744 R HAD CONTACT WITH CANDIDATE IN OTHER WAYS  
 880745 DOES R KNOW ANYONE WHO HAD CONTACT WITH CANDIDATE  
 880746 DID R HAVE ANY CONTACT WITH CANDIDATE  
 880747 DID R MEET CANDIDATE PERSONALLY  
 880748 DID R ATTEND MEETING/GATHERING WHERE CANDIDATE SPOKE  
 880749 DID R TALK WITH CANDIDATE'S STAFF/OFFICE  
 880750 DID R RECEIVE SOMETHING IN MAIL FROM CANDIDATE  
 880751 DID R READ ABOUT CANDIDATE IN NEWSPAPER/MAGAZINE  
 880752 DID R HEAR CANDIDATE ON RADIO  
 880753 DID R SEE CANDIDATE ON TELEVISION  
 880754 R HAD CONTACT WITH CANDIDATE IN OTHER WAYS  
 880755 DOES R KNOW ANYONE WHO HAD CONTACT WITH CANDIDATE

VOTING SECTION: VOTERS

880756 DID R VOTE IN 1988 ELECTION  
 880757 WAS R REGISTERED TO VOTE IN THIS ELECTION  
 880758 IS R REGISTERED TO VOTE AT CURRENT ADDRESS  
 880759 IS R REGISTERED TO VOTE IN THIS STATE  
 880760 IN WHAT STATE IS R REGISTERED

880761 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: IS R REGISTERED TO VOTE IN  
 STATE OF INTERVIEW

880762 DID R VOTE FOR PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE IN 1988  
 ELECTION  
 880763 WHO DID R VOTE FOR IN 1988 ELECTION  
 880764 WAS R'S PREFERENCE STRONG FOR THIS PRESIDENTIAL  
 CANDIDATE  
 880765 WHEN DID R REACH VOTE DECISION  
 880766 DID R VOTE FOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CANDIDATE  
 880767 FOR WHICH HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CANDIDATE DID R  
 VOTE  
 880768 R'S VOTE FOR HOUSE CANDIDATE - PARTY  
 880769 WAS R'S PREFERENCE STRONG FOR HOUSE CANDIDATE

880770 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: WAS THERE A SENATE RACE IN  
 R'S STATE

880771 DID R VOTE FOR A SENATE CANDIDATE  
 880772 FOR WHICH SENATE CANDIDATE DID R VOTE  
 880773 R'S VOTE FOR SENATE CANDIDATE - PARTY

## VOTING SECTION: NON-VOTERS

880774 DID R PREFER ONE CANDIDATE FOR PRESIDENT  
 880775 WHOM DID R PREFER FOR PRESIDENT  
 880776 HOW STRONG WAS R'S PREFERENCE FOR PRESIDENTIAL  
 CANDIDATE  
 880777 DID R PREFER A CANDIDATE FOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
 880778 WHICH HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CANDIDATE DID R  
 PREFER  
 880779 PARTY OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CANDIDATE  
 PREFERRED BY R

## NON-CAMPAIGN CONTACTS WITH U.S. HOUSE INCUMBENT

880780 DID R OR FAMILY MEMBER EVER CONTACT U. S. HOUSE  
 INCUMBENT/OFFICE  
 880781 REASON FOR CONTACT WITH HOUSE INCUMBENT - TO EXPRESS  
 OPINION  
 880782 REASON FOR CONTACT WITH HOUSE INCUMBENT - TO SEEK  
 INFORMATION  
 880783 REASON FOR CONTACT WITH HOUSE INCUMBENT - TO SEEK  
 HELP WITH PROBLEM  
 880784 DID R GET RESPONSE FROM HOUSE INCUMBENT/OFFICE  
 880785 HOW SATISFIED WAS R WITH RESPONSE FROM INCUMBENT  
 880786 DOES R KNOW ANYONE ELSE WHO HAD CONTACT WITH U.S.  
 HOUSE INCUMBENT  
 880787 DID PERSON/GROUP GET RESPONSE FROM HOUSE INCUMBENT/  
 OFFICE  
 880788 HOW SATISFIED WAS PERSON/GROUP WITH RESPONSE FROM  
 INCUMBENT

## R'S ASSESSMENT OF U.S. HOUSE INCUMBENT

880789 R APPROVE/DISAPPROVE OF INCUMBENT'S HANDLING OF JOB  
 880790 STRENGTH OF R'S APPROVAL/DISAPPROVAL OF INCUMBENT'S  
 HANDLING OF JOB  
 880791 HOW HELPFUL WOULD HOUSE INCUMBENT BE WITH ANOTHER  
 PROBLEM  
 880792 ANYTHING SPECIAL DONE BY HOUSE INCUMBENT FOR  
 DISTRICT/PEOPLE  
 880793 HOW WELL DOES U.S. REPRESENTATIVE KEEP IN TOUCH WITH  
 DISTRICT  
 880794 DOES R AGREE/DISAGREE WITH WAY REPRESENTATIVE VOTED  
 880795 DOES R REMEMBER A BILL REPRESENTATIVE VOTED ON  
 880796 DID R AGREE/DISAGREE WITH WAY REPRESENTATIVE VOTED  
 880797 DOES R SEE IMPORTANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PARTIES

## PARTY DIFFERENCES

880798 IMPORTANT PARTY DIFFERENCES: PARTY PREFERENCE -  
 FIRST MENTION  
 880799 PARTY DIFFERENCE CONTENT - FIRST MENTION  
 880800 IMPORTANT PARTY DIFFERENCES: PARTY PREFERENCE -  
 SECOND MENTION  
 880801 PARTY DIFFERENCE CONTENT - SECOND MENTION

880802 IMPORTANT PARTY DIFFERENCES: PARTY PREFERENCE -  
THIRD MENTION  
880803 PARTY DIFFERENCE CONTENT - THIRD MENTION  
880804 IMPORTANT PARTY DIFFERENCES: PARTY PREFERENCE -  
FOURTH MENTION  
880805 PARTY DIFFERENCE CONTENT - FOURTH MENTION  
880806 IMPORTANT PARTY DIFFERENCES: PARTY PREFERENCE -  
FIFTH MENTION  
880807 PARTY DIFFERENCE CONTENT - FIFTH MENTION  
880808 IMPORTANT PARTY DIFFERENCES: PARTY PREFERENCE -  
SIXTH MENTION  
880809 PARTY DIFFERENCE CONTENT - SIXTH MENTION  
880810 DOES R THINK ONE PARTY MORE CONSERVATIVE AT NATIONAL  
LEVEL  
880811 WHICH PARTY DOES R THINK IS MORE CONSERVATIVE

#### IMPORTANT NATIONAL PROBLEMS

880812 HOW OFTEN DOES R FOLLOW GOVERNMENT/PUBLIC AFFAIRS  
880813 WHAT IS MOST IMPORTANT NATIONAL PROBLEM -  
1ST MENTION  
880814 WHAT IS MOST IMPORTANT NATIONAL PROBLEM -  
2ND MENTION  
880815 WHAT IS MOST IMPORTANT NATIONAL PROBLEM -  
3RD MENTION  
  
880816 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: HAS R MENTIONED ANY PROBLEMS  
  
880817 WHAT IS THE SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT NATIONAL PROBLEM  
880818 HOW GOOD A JOB IS GOVERNMENT DOING WITH THIS PROBLEM  
880819 WHICH PARTY WOULD GET GOVERNMENT TO DEAL WITH THIS  
PROBLEM

#### PARTY CONTACTS WITH R DURING THE CAMPAIGN

880820 DID A POLITICAL PARTY WORKER CONTACT R DURING  
CAMPAIGN  
880821 WHICH PARTY(S) CONTACTED R DURING CAMPAIGN  
880822 DID ANYONE ELSE CONTACT R DURING CAMPAIGN  
880823 WHICH CANDIDATE DID THE CONTACT ASK R TO SUPPORT -  
1ST MENTION  
880824 WHICH CANDIDATE DID THE CONTACT ASK R TO SUPPORT -  
2ND MENTION

#### R'S POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

880825 DID R TRY TO INFLUENCE OTHER'S VOTE CHOICES  
880826 DID R WEAR A BUTTON, PUT A STICKER ON THE CAR, OR  
PUT UP A SIGN  
880827 DID R ATTEND ANY POLITICAL MEETINGS OR RALLIES  
880828 DID R WORK FOR PARTY OR CANDIDATE

#### R'S POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

880829 DID R USE \$1 POLITICAL CONTRIBUTION OPTION ON  
FEDERAL INCOME TAX RETURN  
880830 DID R CONTRIBUTE MONEY TO AN INDIVIDUAL CANDIDATE  
880831 R GAVE MONEY TO CANDIDATE FROM WHICH PARTY

880832 DID R GIVE MONEY TO SPECIFIC POLITICAL PARTY  
 880833 WHICH PARTY DID R GIVE MONEY TO  
 880834 DID R GIVE MONEY TO ANY OTHER GROUP SUPPORTING/  
 OPPOSING CANDIDATES  
 880835 WAS R CONTACTED ABOUT REGISTERING OR VOTING  
 880836 DID R RECEIVE REQUESTS THROUGH MAIL FOR POLITICAL  
 CONTRIBUTIONS  
 880837 HOW MANY MAIL REQUESTS DID R GET  
 880838 DID R CONTRIBUTE MONEY BECAUSE OF MAIL REQUESTS  
 880839 DID R RECEIVE PHONE REQUESTS FOR POLITICAL  
 CONTRIBUTIONS  
 880840 HOW MANY PHONE REQUESTS DID R RECEIVE  
 880841 DID R GIVE MONEY BECAUSE OF PHONE REQUESTS  
 880842 DID R RECEIVE PERSONAL REQUEST FOR POL. CONTRIBUTION  
 880843 HOW MANY PERSONAL REQUESTS DID R RECEIVE  
 880844 DID R GIVE MONEY BECAUSE OF PERSONAL REQUESTS

R'S OPINIONS ON VARIOUS SOCIAL/POLITICAL ISSUES

CIVIL RIGHTS/POSITION OF BLACKS

880845 DOES R THINK CIVIL RIGHTS LEADERS ARE PUSHING TOO  
 FAST/SLOW  
 880846 HOW MUCH CHANGE DOES R THINK THERE HAS BEEN IN THE  
 POSITION OF BLACKS

POWER OF GOVERNMENT

880847 DOES R HAVE AN OPINION ON THE POWER OF THE FEDERAL  
 GOVERNMENT  
 880848 DOES R FEEL THE GOVERNMENT IS/IS NOT TOO POWERFUL  
 880849 DOES R THINK THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD/SHOULD NOT  
 BECOME MORE POWERFUL  
 880850 SUMMARY: R'S OPINION ON THE POWER OF THE GOVERNMENT  
 880851 DOES R THINK THE DEMOCRATS/REPUBLICANS FAVOR A  
 POWERFUL GOVERNMENT IN WASHINGTON

LAWS TO PROTECT HOMOSEXUALS AGAINST DISCRIMINATION

880852 DOES R FAVOR/OPOSE LAWS TO PROTECT HOMOSEXUALS  
 AGAINST JOB DISCRIMINATION  
 880853 HOW STRONGLY DOES R FAVOR/OPOSE SUCH LAWS

DEATH PENALTY

880854 DOES R FAVOR/OPOSE THE DEATH PENALTY  
 880855 HOW STRONGLY DOES R FAVOR/OPOSE THE DEATH PENALTY

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION FOR BLACKS

880856 IS R FOR/AGAINST PREFERENTIAL HIRING/PROMOTION OF  
 BLACKS  
 880857 HOW STRONGLY DOES R FAVOR/OPOSE PREFERENTIAL  
 TREATMENT

CONCERN ABOUT CONVENTIONAL/NUCLEAR WAR

880858 HOW WORRIED IS R ABOUT THE U.S. GETTING INTO A  
 CONVENTIONAL WAR  
 880859 HOW WORRIED IS R ABOUT THE U.S. GETTING INTO A

## NUCLEAR WAR

## SOUTH AFRICA

880860 DOES R HAVE AN OPINION ABOUT U.S. POLICY TOWARD  
SOUTH AFRICA  
880861 DOES R FAVOR/OPPOSE U.S. PRESSURE ON SOUTH AFRICA  
880862 HOW STRONGLY DOES R HOLD THIS OPINION  
880863 SUMMARY: R'S ATTITUDE ON POLICY TOWARD SOUTH AFRICA

## GOVT ENSURANCE OF FAIR TREATMENT TO BLACKS

880864 DOES R HAVE AN OPINION ON THE GOVERNMENT ENSURING  
THAT BLACKS RECEIVE FAIR TREATMENT IN JOBS  
880865 DOES R FEEL THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD/SHOULD  
NOT ENSURE FAIR TREATMENT TO BLACKS

## SCHOOL PRAYER

880866 R'S OPINION ON SCHOOL PRAYER  
880867 HOW STRONGLY DOES R FAVOR THEIR OPINION  
880868 SUMMARY: R'S ATTITUDE TOWARD SCHOOL PRAYER

## BLACK STUDENT QUOTAS

880869 R IS FOR/AGAINST QUOTAS TO ADMIT BLACK STUDENTS  
880870 HOW STRONGLY DOES R FAVOR/OPPOSE QUOTAS

## RECOGNITION OF POLITICAL FIGURES

880871 DOES R KNOW WHAT JOB/OFFICE TED KENNEDY HOLDS  
880872 DOES R KNOW WHAT JOB/OFFICE GEORGE SCHULTZ HOLDS  
880873 DOES R KNOW WHAT JOB/OFFICE WILLIAM REHNQUIST HOLDS  
880874 DOES R KNOW WHAT JOB/OFFICE MIKHAIL GORBACHEV HOLDS  
880875 DOES R KNOW WHAT JOB/OFFICE MARGARET THATCHER HOLDS  
880876 DOES R KNOW WHAT JOB/OFFICE YASSER ARAFAT HOLDS  
880877 DOES R KNOW WHAT JOB/OFFICE JIM WRIGHT HOLDS

## R'S KNOWLEDGE OF PARTY REPRESENTATION IN CONGRESS

880878 DOES R KNOW WHICH PARTY HAD THE MOST MEMBERS IN THE  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES BEFORE THE ELECTION  
880879 DOES R KNOW WHICH PARTY HAD THE MOST MEMBERS IN THE  
SENATE BEFORE THE ELECTION

## R'S ASSESSMENT OF CONGRESS

880880 DOES R APPROVE/DISAPPROVE OF THE WAY CONGRESS HAS BEEN  
HANDLING ITS JOB  
880881 HOW STRONGLY DOES R APPROVE/DISAPPROVE

## PROBE INDICATORS FOR POST-ELECTION SECTIONS H AND J

880882 WAS QUESTION H1 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
880883 WAS QUESTION H2 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
880884 WAS QUESTION H3A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER



880885 WAS QUESTION H4 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880886 WAS QUESTION H5 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880887 WAS QUESTION H6 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880888 WAS QUESTION H9A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880889 WAS QUESTION H10 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880890 WAS QUESTION J2 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880891 WAS QUESTION J3A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880892 WAS QUESTION J3B PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880893 WAS QUESTION J3C PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880894 WAS QUESTION J3D PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880895 WAS QUESTION J3E PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880896 WAS QUESTION J3F PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880897 WAS QUESTION J3G PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

880898 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: FORM A OR B

VARIABLES 899-923: REAGAN RETROSPECTIVE QUESTIONS  
 R'S EVALUATION OF THE PAST EIGHT YEARS  
 (SEE ALSO VARIABLES 881002-881043)

EFFORTS TO PROTECT THE ENVIRONMENT

880899 HAVE EFFORTS TO PROTECT THE ENVIRONMENT INCREASED/  
 DECREASED/STAYED ABOUT THE SAME  
 880900 R APPROVES/DISAPPROVES OF INCREASING PROGRAMS TO  
 PROTECT THE ENVIRONMENT  
 880901 DOES R THINK THESE PROGRAMS SHOULD HAVE INCREASED/  
 DECREASED/STAYED ABOUT THE SAME  
 880902 R APPROVES/DISAPPROVES OF DECREASING THESE PROGRAMS  
 880903 SUMMARY: R'S ATTITUDE ON EFFORTS TO PROTECT THE  
 ENVIRONMENT

LEVEL OF SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

880904 HAVE SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS INCREASED/DECREASED/  
 STAYED ABOUT THE SAME  
 880905 R APPROVES/DISAPPROVES OF INCREASE IN SOCIAL  
 SECURITY BENEFITS  
 880906 DOES R THINK BENEFITS SHOULD HAVE INCREASED/  
 DECREASED/STAYED ABOUT THE SAME  
 880907 R APPROVES/DISAPPROVES OF DECREASE IN BENEFITS  
 880908 SUMMARY: R'S ATTITUDE ON LEVEL OF SOCIAL SECURITY  
 BENEFITS

LEVEL OF DEFENSE SPENDING

880909 HAS DEFENSE SPENDING INCREASED/DECREASED/STAYED  
 ABOUT THE SAME  
 880910 R APPROVES/DISAPPROVES OF INCREASE IN DEFENSE  
 SPENDING  
 880911 DOES R THINK DEFENSE SPENDING SHOULD HAVE  
 INCREASED/DECREASED/STAYED ABOUT THE SAME  
 880912 R APPROVES/DISAPPROVES OF DECREASED DEFENSE  
 SPENDING  
 880913 SUMMARY: R'S ATTITUDE ON LEVEL OF DEFENSE SPENDING

LEVEL OF SPENDING ON POVERTY

880914 HAS SPENDING ON ASSISTANCE TO THE POOR INCREASED/

DECREASED/STAYED ABOUT THE SAME  
 880915 R APPROVES/DISAPPROVES OF INCREASED ASSISTANCE FOR  
 THE POOR  
 880916 DOES R THINK ASSISTANCE TO THE POOR SHOULD HAVE  
 INCREASED/DECREASED/STAYED ABOUT THE SAME  
 880917 R APPROVES/DISAPPROVES OF DECREASED ASSISTANCE TO  
 THE POOR  
 880918 SUMMARY: R'S ATTITUDE ON LEVEL OF SPENDING ON  
 POVERTY

LEVEL OF SPENDING ON EDUCATION

880919 HAS SPENDING ON PUBLIC SCHOOLS INCREASED/DECREASED/  
 STAYED ABOUT THE SAME  
 880920 R APPROVES/DISAPPROVES OF INCREASED SPENDING FOR  
 SCHOOLS  
 880921 DOES R THINK SPENDING FOR SCHOOLS SHOULD HAVE  
 INCREASED/DECREASED/STAYED ABOUT THE SAME  
 880922 R APPROVES/DISAPPROVES OF DECREASED SPENDING FOR  
 SCHOOLS  
 880923 SUMMARY: R'S ATTITUDE ON LEVEL OF SPENDING ON  
 EDUCATION

VARs 924-974: QUESTION ORDER EXPERIMENT

EQUAL RIGHTS - R AGREE/DISAGREE

880924 SOCIETY SHOULD ENSURE EQUAL OPPORTUNITY TO SUCCEED  
 880925 WE HAVE GONE TOO FAR IN PUSHING EQUAL RIGHTS  
 880926 WE SHOULD WORRY LESS ABOUT EQUALITY  
 880927 IT IS NOT A PROBLEM IF PEOPLE HAVE UNEQUAL CHANCES  
 880928 WE WOULD HAVE FEWER PROBLEMS IF PEOPLE WERE TREATED  
 MORE EQUALLY  
 880929 A PROBLEM IN THIS COUNTRY IS THAT WE DON'T GIVE  
 EVERYONE AN EQUAL CHANCE

R'S CHOICE OF GOALS FOR THE NATION

880930 R'S CHOICE OF MOST DESIRABLE GOAL FOR THE NATION  
 880931 R'S CHOICE OF SECOND GOAL FOR OUR NATION

IMPORTANCE OF RELIGION TO R

880932 IS RELIGION AN IMPORTANT PART OF R'S LIFE  
 880933 HOW MUCH GUIDANCE DOES RELIGION PROVIDE TO R'S LIFE  
 880934 R'S VIEW ABOUT THE BIBLE  
 880935 HOW OFTEN DOES R PRAY

GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS - R AGREE/DISAGREE

880936 PEOPLE WHO DON'T CARE ABOUT AN ELECTION OUTCOME  
 SHOULDN'T VOTE  
 880937 PEOPLE LIKE ME DON'T HAVE ANY SAY ABOUT GOVERNMENT  
 880938 PUBLIC OFFICIALS DON'T CARE WHAT PEOPLE LIKE ME  
 THINK  
 880939 POLITICS ARE SO COMPLICATED A PERSON LIKE ME CAN'T  
 UNDERSTAND WHAT'S GOING ON  
 880940 I HAVE A GOOD UNDERSTANDING OF THE ISSUES FACING  
 OUR COUNTRY

880941 I AM WELL-QUALIFIED TO PARTICIPATE IN POLITICS  
 880942 I COULD DO AS GOOD A JOB IN PUBLIC OFFICE AS  
 MOST OTHERS  
 880943 I AM BETTER INFORMED ABOUT POLITICS THAN MOST  
 880944 TAXES SHOULD BE CUT EVEN IF IT PUTS OFF IMPORTANT  
 THINGS TO BE DONE

WHAT R MEANS BY LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE

880945 WHAT R MEANS BY LIBERAL - FIRST MENTION  
 880946 WHAT R MEANS BY LIBERAL - SECOND MENTION  
 880947 WHAT R MEANS BY LIBERAL - THIRD MENTION  
 880948 WHAT R MEANS BY CONSERVATIVE - FIRST MENTION  
 880949 WHAT R MEANS BY CONSERVATIVE - SECOND MENTION  
 880950 WHAT R MEANS BY CONSERVATIVE - THIRD MENTION

R'S OPINIONS ON MORALITY IN SOCIETY

880951 WE SHOULD ADJUST MORAL BEHAVIOR TO CHANGES IN THE  
 WORLD  
 880952 WE SHOULD BE MORE TOLERANT OF PEOPLE WITH DIFFERENT  
 MORAL STANDARDS  
 880953 THERE WOULD BE FEWER PROBLEMS IF MORE EMPHASIS WAS  
 PLACED ON TRADITIONAL FAMILY TIES  
 880954 NEWER LIFESTYLES ARE CONTRIBUTING TO SOCIETAL  
 BREAKDOWN

R'S FEELINGS ABOUT GOVERNMENT IN GENERAL

880955 HOW MUCH OF THE TIME DOES R THINK HE/SHE CAN  
 TRUST GOVERNMENT  
 880956 HOW MUCH DOES THE GOVERNMENT WASTE OUR TAX DOLLARS  
 880957 IS GOVERNMENT RUN BY A FEW BIG INTERESTS OR FOR THE  
 BENEFIT OF ALL  
 880958 HOW MANY PEOPLE IN GOVERNMENT DOES R THINK ARE  
 CROOKED  
 880959 HOW MUCH DOES R FEEL ELECTIONS MAKE GOVERNMENT  
 LISTEN TO PEOPLE  
 880960 HOW MUCH ATTENTION DOES R FEEL GOVERNMENT PAYS TO  
 WHAT PEOPLE THINK

R'S OPINIONS ON EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR BLACKS

880961 BLACKS SHOULD OVERCOME PREJUDICE WITHOUT ANY  
 SPECIAL FAVORS  
 880962 BLACKS HAVE GOTTEN LESS THAN THEY DESERVE OVER THE  
 PAST FEW YEARS  
 880963 IF BLACKS WOULD TRY HARDER THEY COULD BE JUST AS  
 WELL OFF AS WHITES  
 880964 GENERATIONS OF SLAVERY AND DISCRIMINATION MAKE IT  
 DIFFICULT FOR BLACKS TO MOVE UP  
 880965 EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IS IMPORTANT BUT NOT THE  
 GOVERNMENT'S JOB TO GUARANTEE

R'S OPINION ON A STRONG MILITARY

880966 IS A STRONG MILITARY OR THE BARGAINING TABLE THE  
 BETTER WAY TO KEEP PEACE  
 880967 HOW IMPORTANT IS A STRONG MILITARY FORCE FOR  
 DEALING WITH OUR ENEMIES

## R'S FEELINGS ABOUT BEING AN AMERICAN

880968 HOW GOOD DOES R FEEL SEEING THE AMERICAN FLAG FLY  
 880969 HOW STRONG IS R'S LOVE FOR HIS/HER COUNTRY  
 880970 HOW EMOTIONAL DOES R FEEL HEARING THE NATIONAL  
 ANTHEM  
 880971 HOW PROUD IS R TO BE AN AMERICAN

## R'S OPINION ON U.S. WORLD POWER/COMMUNIST THREAT

880972 THE U.S. SHOULD REMAIN THE WORLD'S MOST POWERFUL  
 NATION EVEN IF IT MEANS RISKING WAR  
 880973 ANY COMMUNIST COUNTRY IS A THREAT TO THE U.S.  
 880974 THE U.S. SHOULD DO EVERYTHING IT CAN TO PREVENT THE  
 SPREAD OF COMMUNISM

## PROBE INDICATORS FOR QUESTION ORDER EXPERIMENT - FORM A

880975 WAS QUESTION M1A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880976 WAS QUESTION M1B PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880977 WAS QUESTION M1C PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880978 WAS QUESTION M1D PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880979 WAS QUESTION M1E PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880980 WAS QUESTION M1F PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880981 WAS QUESTION M1G PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880982 WAS QUESTION M1H PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880983 WAS QUESTION M1J PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880984 WAS QUESTION M4A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880985 WAS QUESTION M4B PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880986 WAS QUESTION M4C PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880987 WAS QUESTION M4D PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880988 WAS QUESTION M11A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880989 WAS QUESTION M11B PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880990 WAS QUESTION M11C PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880991 WAS QUESTION M11D PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880992 WAS QUESTION M11E PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880993 WAS QUESTION M12 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880994 WAS QUESTION M13 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880995 WAS QUESTION M14A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880996 WAS QUESTION M14B PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880997 WAS QUESTION M14C PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880998 WAS QUESTION M14D PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 880999 WAS QUESTION M15A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 881000 WAS QUESTION M15B PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 881001 WAS QUESTION M15C PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

VARIABLES 1002-1043: REAGAN RETROSPECTIVE QUESTIONS  
 R'S EVALUATION OF THE PAST EIGHT YEARS  
 (ALSO VARIABLES 88899-88923)

ANYTHING R LIKES ABOUT WHAT REAGAN HAS DONE AS  
 PRESIDENT

881002 IS THERE ANYTHING R LIKES ABOUT WHAT REAGAN HAS  
 881002 DONE AS PRESIDENT  
 881003 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT REAGAN - FIRST MENTION  
 881004 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT REAGAN - SECOND MENTION

881005 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT REAGAN - THIRD MENTION  
 881006 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT REAGAN - FOURTH MENTION  
 881007 WHAT R LIKES ABOUT REAGAN - FIFTH MENTION

ANYTHING R DISLIKES ABOUT WHAT REAGAN HAS DONE AS  
 PRESIDENT

881008 IS THERE ANYTHING R DISLIKES ABOUT WHAT REAGAN HAS  
 DONE AS PRESIDENT  
 881009 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT REAGAN - FIRST MENTION  
 881010 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT REAGAN - SECOND MENTION  
 881011 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT REAGAN - THIRD REAGAN  
 881012 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT REAGAN - FOURTH MENTION  
 881013 WHAT R DISLIKES ABOUT REAGAN - FIFTH MENTION

QUALITIES DESCRIBING REAGAN

881014 HOW WELL DOES "INTELLIGENT" DESCRIBE REAGAN  
 881015 HOW WELL DOES "COMPASSIONATE" DESCRIBE REAGAN  
 881016 HOW WELL DOES "MORAL" DESCRIBE REAGAN  
 881017 HOW WELL DOES "INSPIRING" DESCRIBE REAGAN  
 881018 HOW WELL DOES "PROVIDES STRONG LEADERSHIP" DESCRIBE  
 REAGAN  
 881019 HOW WELL DOES "DECENT" DESCRIBE REAGAN  
 881020 HOW WELL DOES "REALLY CARES ABOUT PEOPLE LIKE YOU"  
 DESCRIBE REAGAN  
 881021 HOW WELL DOES "KNOWLEDGEABLE" DESCRIBE REAGAN  
 881022 HOW WELL DOES "HONEST" DESCRIBE REAGAN

R'S FEELINGS ABOUT REAGAN

881023 HAS REAGAN MADE R FEEL ANGRY  
 881024 HAS REAGAN MADE R FEEL HOPEFUL  
 881025 HAS REAGAN MADE R FEEL AFRAID OF HIM  
 881026 HAS REAGAN MADE R FEEL PROUD

UNEMPLOYMENT BETTER/WORSE SINCE 1980

881027 DOES R THINK UNEMPLOYMENT HAS GOTTEN BETTER/WORSE/  
 STAYED ABOUT THE SAME SINCE 1980  
 881028 HOW MUCH BETTER/WORSE IS UNEMPLOYMENT

INFLATION BETTER/WORSE SINCE 1980

881029 DOES R THINK THAT INFLATION HAS GOTTEN BETTER/  
 WORSE/STAYED THE SAME SINCE 1980  
 881030 HOW MUCH BETTER/WORSE IS INFLATION

ECONOMY BETTER/WORSE SINCE 1980

881031 DOES R THINK REAGAN'S ECONOMIC POLICIES HAVE MADE  
 THE ECONOMY BETTER/WORSE/NOT MADE MUCH DIFFERENCE  
 881032 HOW MUCH BETTER/WORSE HAVE REAGAN'S POLICIES MADE  
 THE ECONOMY  
 881033 HAS R BEEN HELPED OR HURT BY REAGAN'S ECONOMIC  
 PROGRAM

U.S. MORE/LESS SECURE FROM FOREIGN ENEMIES

881034 DOES R THINK REAGAN'S POLICIES HAVE MADE THE U.S.

MORE/LESS SECURE FROM FOREIGN ENEMIES  
881035 HOW MUCH MORE/LESS SECURE IS U.S.

BUDGET DEFICIT SMALLER/LARGER SINCE 1980

881036 DOES R THINK THE BUDGET DEFICIT IS SMALLER/LARGER/  
STAYED ABOUT THE SAME SINCE 1980  
881037 HOW MUCH SMALLER/LARGER IS THE BUDGET DEFICIT

GOVERNMENT MORE/LESS HONEST SINCE 1980

881038 DOES R THINK PEOPLE IN GOVERNMENT ARE MORE/LESS  
HONEST THAN IN 1980  
881039 HOW MUCH MORE/LESS HONEST ARE PEOPLE IN GOVERNMENT

EFFORTS AGAINST DISCRIMINATION INCREASED/DECREASED

881040 DOES R THINK EFFORTS TO PROTECT BLACKS FROM  
DISCRIMINATION HAVE INCREASED/DECREASED/STAYED THE  
SAME SINCE 1980  
881041 DOES R APPROVE/DISAPPROVE OF THIS INCREASE/DECREASE

OVERALL, R APPROVE/DISAPPROVE OF REAGAN'S PRESIDENCY

881042 OVERALL, DOES R APPROVE/DISAPPROVE OF REAGAN'S  
HANDLING OF THE PRESIDENCY  
881043 HOW STRONGLY DOES R APPROVE/DISAPPROVE

PROBE INDICATORS FOR PRE-ELECTION SECTION P

881044 WAS QUESTION P5 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
881045 WAS QUESTION P6 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
881046 WAS QUESTION P7 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
881047 WAS QUESTION P8 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
881048 WAS QUESTION P9 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
881049 WAS QUESTION P10 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
881050 WAS QUESTION P11 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
881051 WAS QUESTION P12 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
881052 WAS QUESTION P13 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

PROBE INDICATORS FOR POST-ELECTION SECTIONS N, P & Q

881053 WAS QUESTION N4A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
881054 WAS QUESTION N4B PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
881055 WAS QUESTION N4C PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
881056 WAS QUESTION N4D PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
881057 WAS QUESTION N5 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
881058 WAS QUESTION N6 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
881059 WAS QUESTION N7 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
881060 WAS QUESTION N8 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
881061 WAS QUESTION N9 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
881062 WAS QUESTION N10 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
881063 WAS QUESTION N11 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
881064 WAS QUESTION N12 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
881065 WAS QUESTION N13 PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
881066 WAS QUESTION P1A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
881067 WAS QUESTION P1B PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
881068 WAS QUESTION P1C PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

881069 WAS QUESTION P1D PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 881070 WAS QUESTION P1E PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 881071 WAS QUESTION Q1A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 881072 WAS QUESTION Q1B PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 881073 WAS QUESTION Q1C PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 881074 WAS QUESTION Q1D PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 881075 WAS QUESTION Q1E PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 881076 WAS QUESTION Q1F PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 881077 WAS QUESTION Q4A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 881078 WAS QUESTION Q4B PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 881079 WAS QUESTION Q4C PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 881080 WAS QUESTION Q4D PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 881081 WAS QUESTION Q4E PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 881082 WAS QUESTION Q4F PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 881083 WAS QUESTION Q11A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 881084 WAS QUESTION Q11B PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 881085 WAS QUESTION Q11C PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 881086 WAS QUESTION Q11D PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 881087 WAS QUESTION Q14A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 881088 WAS QUESTION Q14B PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 881089 WAS QUESTION Q14C PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 881090 WAS QUESTION Q14D PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 881091 WAS QUESTION Q15A PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 881092 WAS QUESTION Q15B PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 881093 WAS QUESTION Q15C PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 881094 WAS QUESTION Q15D PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 881095 WAS QUESTION Q15E PROBED BY INTERVIEWER  
 881096 WAS QUESTION Q15F PROBED BY INTERVIEWER

#### R'S IDENTIFICATION WITH GROUPS IN SOCIETY

881097 DOES R FEEL CLOSE TO POOR PEOPLE  
 881098 DOES R FEEL CLOSE TO LIBERALS  
 881099 DOES R FEEL CLOSE TO THE ELDERLY  
 881100 DOES R FEEL CLOSE TO BLACKS  
 881101 DOES R FEEL CLOSE TO LABOR UNIONS  
 881102 DOES R FEEL CLOSE TO FEMINISTS  
 881103 DOES R FEEL CLOSE TO CHRISTIAN FUNDAMENTALISTS  
 881104 DOES R FEEL CLOSE TO BUSINESS PEOPLE  
 881105 DOES R FEEL CLOSE TO YOUNG PEOPLE  
 881106 DOES R FEEL CLOSE TO CONSERVATIVES  
 881107 DOES R FEEL CLOSE TO WOMEN  
 881108 DOES R FEEL CLOSE TO WORKING PEOPLE  
 881109 DOES R FEEL CLOSE TO WHITES  
 881110 DOES F FEEL CLOSE TO EVANGELICAL GROUPS ACTIVE IN  
 POLITICS  
 881111 DOES R FEEL CLOSE TO MIDDLE-CLASS PEOPLE  
  
 881112 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: R MENTIONED MORE THAN ONE  
 GROUP  
  
 881113 TO WHICH GROUP DOES R FEEL CLOSEST  
 881114 DOES R BELONG TO ORGANIZATIONS OF CLOSEST GROUP

#### PARTY IDENTIFICATION OF R'S PARENTS

881115 WAS R'S FATHER DEMOCRAT/REPUBLICAN/INDEPENDENT  
 881116 WAS R'S MOTHER DEMOCRAT/REPUBLICAN/INDEPENDENT

## VOTE VALIDATION

881117 ELECTION OFFICE NUMBER  
 881118 DOES R HAVE A REGISTRATION RECORD IN THIS OFFICE  
 881119 WAS THE CROSS-REFERENCE FILE CHECKED  
 881120 WHERE WAS THE REGISTRATION RECORD FOUND  
 881121 MONTH OF PURGE/APPLICATION  
 881122 DAY OF PURGE/APPLICATION  
 881123 YEAR OF PURGE/APPLICATION  
  
 881124 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: PURGE/APPLICATION DATE  
  
 881125 DOES R'S NAME ON COVERSHEET LABEL MATCH THE NAME ON  
 THE REGISTRATION RECORD  
 881126 MONTH OF BIRTH ON REGISTRATION RECORD  
 881127 YEAR OF BIRTH ON REGISTRATION RECORD  
 881128 DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SELF-REPORTED BIRTHDATE AND  
 BIRTHDATE ON REGISTRATION RECORD  
 881129 DOES R'S ADDRESS ON COVERSHEET LABEL MATCH THE ADDRESS  
 ON THE REGISTRATION RECORD  
 881130 R'S PRECINCT/ELECTION DISTRICT NUMBER/DESIGNATION  
 881131 KINDS OF REGISTRATION RECORDS KEPT BY ELECTION OFFICE  
 881132 REGISTRATION RECORDS NOT ACCESSIBLE FOR CHECKING  
  
 881133 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: VOTE INFORMATION ON  
 REGISTRATION RECORDS  
  
 881134 DOES THE REGISTRATION RECORD INDICATE THAT R VOTED  
 881135 DO VOTE RECORDS INDICATE R VOTED IN NOVEMBER 1988  
 GENERAL ELECTION  
 881136 WHICH VOTE RECORD INDICATED R VOTED  
 881137 WERE ALL VOTE RECORDS ACCESSIBLE FOR CHECKING  
 881138 WHICH VOTE RECORDS WERE NOT AVAILABLE FOR CHECKING  
 881139 MONTH R LAST VOTED  
 881140 DAY R LAST VOTED  
 881141 YEAR R LAST VOTED  
 881142 R'S SELF-REPORTED VOTE  
 881143 WAS CHECK MADE FOR R'S REGISTRATION VOTING RECORD  
 881144 SUMMARY: REGISTRATION RECORD FOUND  
 881145 AVAILABILITY OF VOTING RECORDS  
 881146 RECORD OF R VOTING - EXCLUDING NO SELF-REPORT  
 881147 SUMMARY: ASSIGNMENT OF R TO VOTE/NON-VOTE  
 881148 RECORD OF R VOTING - INCLUDING NO SELF-REPORT

## ELECTION ADMINISTRATION SURVEY

881149 MONTH OF ELECTION ADMINISTRATION INTERVIEW  
 881150 DAY OF ELECTION ADMINISTRATION INTERVIEW  
 881151 LENGTH OF ELECTION ADMINISTRATION INTERVIEW  
 881152 DISPOSITION OF REGISTRATION RECORDS WHEN OFFICE  
 NOTIFIED PEOPLE MOVED OUT OF JURISDICTION  
 881153 DISPOSITION OF REGISTRATION RECORDS WHEN OFFICE  
 NOTIFIED OF DEATH OR FELONY CONVICTION  
 881154 ARE REGISTRATION RECORDS DELETED FROM ACTIVE FILES  
 BECAUSE OF NON-VOTING  
 881155 ARE PEOPLE FIRST NOTIFIED THAT THEY WILL BE  
 DELETED/PURGED



881156 PROCEDURE FOR PURGING OF RECORDS - FIRST MENTION  
881157 PROCEDURE FOR PURGING OF RECORDS - SECOND MENTION  
881158 PROCEDURE FOR PURGING OF RECORDS - THIRD MENTION  
881159 CAN PEOPLE STAY REGISTERED OR ARE THEY REQUIRED TO  
RE-REGISTER  
881160 TIME INTERVAL FOR DELETION OF RECORDS/NOTICES OF  
INTENT  
881161 DISPOSITION OF RECORDS DELETED BECAUSE OF NON-VOTING  
881162 FOR HOW LONG ARE DELETED RECORDS FILED  
881163 ARE THESE RECORDS CALLED PURGED/INACTIVE/OTHER  
881164 ARE THESE RECORDS ACCESSIBLE  
881165 ARE THERE STANDARD PROCEDURES TO CONFIRM CURRENT  
ADDRESS OF REGISTERED VOTERS  
881166 IS THIS RESIDENCY CHECK PERFORMED FOR ALL OR JUST  
NON-VOTERS  
881167 NON-VOTERS: HOW LONG MUST IT HAVE BEEN SINCE LAST  
VOTED  
  
881168 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: NON-VOTERS/ALL OTHERS  
  
881169 HOW OFTEN IS RESIDENCY CHECK PERFORMED FOR EVERYONE  
881170 DISPOSITION OF RECORD WHEN CHECK DETERMINES CHANGE OF  
ADDRESS  
881171 CAN INACTIVE REGISTRANT VOTE BY SHOWING NEW PROOF OF  
ADDRESS ON ELECTION DAY  
881172 DOES INACTIVE REGISTRANT GO TO VOTING PLACE FOR  
PREVIOUS OR CURRENT ADDRESS IF THEY WANT TO VOTE ON  
ELECTION DAY  
881173 DOES OFFICE HAVE A MASTER FILE FOR ALL REGISTRATION  
RECORDS  
881174 IS MASTER FILE ON A COMPUTER  
881175 IS PRECINCT NUMBER ON THE RECORD OF EACH PERSON  
881176 IS EXACT ADDRESS OR PRECINCT NECESSARY TO LOCATE A  
RECORD  
881177 WITH MASTER FILE, CAN REGISTRANT BE IDENTIFIED FROM AN  
ADDRESS  
881178 DOES MASTER FILE INDICATE WHETHER A PERSON VOTED IN A  
PARTICULAR ELECTION  
881179 IS THE ENTRY PROCESS COMPLETE FOR THE 1988 GENERAL  
ELECTION  
881180 IS ANOTHER KIND OF MASTER FILE KEPT  
881181 IS OTHER FILE KEPT ON A COMPUTER  
881182 IS PRECINCT NUMBER ON THE RECORD OF EACH PERSON  
881183 IS EXACT ADDRESS OR PRECINCT NECESSARY TO LOCATE A  
RECORD  
881184 WITH OTHER FILE, CAN REGISTRANT BE IDENTIFIED FROM AN  
ADDRESS  
881185 DOES OTHER FILE INDICATE WHETHER A PERSON VOTED IN A  
PARTICULAR ELECTION  
881186 IS THE ENTRY PROCESS COMPLETE FOR THE 1988 GENERAL  
ELECTION  
  
881187 INTERVIEWER CHECKPOINT: EITHER MASTER OR OTHER FILE  
INDICATES WHETHER A PERSON VOTED IN A PARTICULAR  
ELECTION  
  
881188 ANY OTHER REGISTRATION RECORDS THAT CONTAIN  
INFORMATION ABOUT VOTING PARTICIPATION  
  
REGISTRATION RECORDS CONTAIN VOTE INFORMATION

881189 ARE LISTS OF PERSONS ELIGIBLE TO VOTE PROVIDED TO  
PRECINCTS ON ELECTION DAY  
881190 WHAT ARE THESE LISTS CALLED - FIRST MENTION  
881191 WHAT ARE THESE LISTS CALLED - SECOND MENTION  
881192 ARE THESE LISTS MARKED BY OFFICIALS TO INDICATE THAT  
SOMEONE VOTED  
881193 ARE THESE LISTS SIGNED BY THE VOTERS THEMSELVES  
881194 ARE VOTERS REQUIRED TO SIGN A BALLOT APPLICATION/  
VOUCHER  
881195 ARE FILES OF BALLOT APPLICATIONS KEPT  
881196 ARE RECORDS KEPT OF APPLICATIONS FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT  
881197 ARE REGISTRATION RECORDS MARKED WHEN AN ABSENTEE  
BALLOT IS RETURNED

REGISTRATION RECORDS DO NOT CONTAIN VOTE INFORMATION

881198 MUST USE VOTING, AND NOT REGISTRATION, RECORDS FOR  
VOTING INFORMATION  
881199 VOTING INFORMATION IS KEPT ON REGISTRATION MASTER  
FILE/SET OF REGISTRATION RECORDS/OTHER  
881200 VOTE RECORDS KEPT IN THIS/OTHER OFFICE  
881201 ARE LISTS OF PERSONS ELIGIBLE TO VOTE PROVIDED TO  
PRECINCTS ON ELECTION DAY  
881202 ARE THESE LISTS MARKED BY OFFICIALS TO INDICATE THAT  
SOMEONE VOTED  
881203 ARE THESE LISTS SIGNED BY THE VOTERS THEMSELVES  
881204 ARE VOTERS REQUIRED TO SIGN A BALLOT APPLICATION/  
VOUCHER  
881205 ARE FILES OF BALLOT APPLICATIONS KEPT  
881206 ARE RECORDS KEPT OF APPLICATIONS FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT  
881207 ARE REGISTRATION RECORDS MARKED WHEN AN ABSENTEE  
BALLOT IS RETURNED  
881208 IS A VOTER'S PRECINCT/ELECTION DISTRICT NEEDED TO FIND  
A PERSON'S NAME ON THE VOTING RECORDS  
881209 IF LACKING A PRECINCT NUMBER, CAN IT BE RETRIEVED FROM  
THE REGISTRATION RECORD  
  
881210 HOW SOON BEFORE A FEDERAL ELECTION MUST PEOPLE BE  
REGISTERED TO VOTE  
881211 HOW MANY PEOPLE REGISTERED FOR THE FIRST TIME ON  
ELECTION DAY, NOVEMBER 1988  
881212 HOW MANY PEOPLE REGISTERED FOR THE FIRST TIME DURING  
THE CALENDAR YEAR 1988  
881213 APPROXIMATE NUMBER REGISTERED AT THE END OF 1987  
881214 APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF REGISTRATION RECORDS PURGED  
DURING 1988  
881215 APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF REGISTERED VOTERS AS OF TODAY  
881216 SUMMARY: NUMBER OF NEW REGISTRATIONS DURING 1988  
881217 NUMBER OF ELECTION DISTRICTS/PRECINCTS IN THIS  
JURISDICTION  
881218 NUMBER OF POLLING PLACES FOR A GENERAL ELECTION  
881219 TIME LAG BETWEEN REGISTRATION AND COMPLETION OF  
PROCESSING  
881220 REGISTRATION AT THIS LOCATION OR AT ANOTHER LOCALE  
881221 REGISTRATION ALL YEAR YEAR ROUND/CERTAIN TIMES  
881222 IS THIS OFFICE THE ONLY PLACE WHERE PEOPLE CAN  
REGISTER  
881223 IS THIS ALWAYS THE ONLY OFFICE, OR ARE SOME LOCATIONS  
OPEN TEMPORARILY BEFORE ELECTIONS

## OTHER LOCATIONS FOR REGISTRATION - YEAR ROUND

881224 PUBLIC LIBRARIES  
 881225 FIRE STATIONS  
 881226 SHOPPING MALLS/MARKETS  
 881227 POST OFFICES  
 881228 DRIVERS' LICENSE RENEWAL (SEC'Y OF STATE OFFICE)  
 881229 SHERIFF'S OFFICE/POLICE STATIONS  
 881230 COURTHOUSE  
 881231 COLLEGE DORMS/UNIONS  
 881232 APARTMENT COMPLEX CLUBHOUSE/COMMONS  
 881233 COMMUNITY CENTERS/SENIOR CITIZENS CENTERS  
 881234 ATHLETIC CLUB/YMCA  
 881235 ORGANIZATION MEETING PLACE  
 881236 CHURCHES/PARISH HALL  
 881237 SOMEONE'S HOUSE  
 881238 VOLUNTEERS GOING DOOR-TO-DOOR  
 881239 SPECIAL MOBILE UNITS  
 881240 OTHER  
 881241 OTHER - SPECIFIED

## OTHER LOCATIONS FOR REGISTRATION - TEMPORARY BEFORE ELECTIONS

881242 CAN PEOPLE REGISTER AT OTHER LOCATIONS OPEN TEMPORARILY BEFORE ELECTIONS

881243 PUBLIC LIBRARIES  
 881244 FIRE STATIONS  
 881245 SHOPPING MALLS/MARKETS  
 881246 POST OFFICES  
 881247 DRIVERS' LICENSE RENEWAL (SEC'Y OF STATE OFFICE)  
 881248 SHERIFF'S OFFICE/POLICE STATIONS  
 881249 COURTHOUSE  
 881250 COLLEGE DORMS/UNIONS  
 881251 APARTMENT COMPLEX CLUBHOUSE/COMMONS  
 881252 COMMUNITY CENTERS/SENIOR CITIZENS CENTERS  
 881253 ATHLETIC CLUB/YMCA  
 881254 ORGANIZATION MEETING PLACE  
 881255 CHURCHES/PARISH HALL  
 881256 SOMEONE'S HOUSE  
 881257 VOLUNTEERS GOING DOOR-TO-DOOR  
 881258 SPECIAL MOBILE UNITS  
 881259 OTHER  
 881260 OTHER - SPECIFIED  
 881261 WHEN ARE THESE OTHER PLACES OPEN

881262 DOES JURISDICTION HAVE DEPUTY REGISTRARS  
 881263 NUMBER OF DEPUTY REGISTRARS  
 881264 QUALIFICATIONS FOR DEPUTY REGISTRAR - FIRST MENTION  
 881265 QUALIFICATIONS FOR DEPUTY REGISTRAR - SECOND MENTION  
 881266 QUALIFICATIONS FOR DEPUTY REGISTRAR - THIRD MENTION  
 881267 ARE THERE LIMITS ON THE NUMBER OF DEPUTY REGISTRARS  
 881268 LIMITS ON THE NUMBER OF DEPUTY REGISTRARS - FIRST MENTION  
 881269 LIMITS ON THE NUMBER OF DEPUTY REGISTRARS - SECOND MENTION  
 881270 ARE THERE LIMITS ON WHERE DEPUTY REGISTRARS CAN GO TO REGISTER VOTERS

881271 LIMITATIONS ON WHERE DEPUTY REGISTRARS CAN GO TO REGISTER VOTERS - FIRST MENTION

881272 LIMITATIONS ON WHERE DEPUTY REGISTRARS CAN GO TO REGISTER VOTERS - SECOND MENTION

881273 LIMITATIONS ON WHERE DEPUTY REGISTRARS CAN GO TO REGISTER VOTERS - THIRD MENTION

881274 ARE THERE LIMITS ON THE HOURS DEPUTY REGISTRARS CAN WORK

881275 LIMITATIONS ON THE HOURS DEPUTY REGISTRARS CAN WORK - FIRST MENTION

881276 LIMITATIONS ON THE HOURS DEPUTY REGISTRARS CAN WORK - SECOND MENTION

881277 CAN PEOPLE REGISTER INITIALLY BY MAIL

881278 WHERE DO PEOPLE PICK UP MAIL APPLICATIONS - FIRST MENTION

881279 WHERE DO PEOPLE PICK UP MAIL APPLICATIONS - SECOND MENTION

881280 WHERE DO PEOPLE PICK UP MAIL APPLICATIONS - THIRD MENTION

881281 ARE MAIL APPLICATIONS ON DISPLAY AT THESE PLACES

881282 DAYS OF THE WEEK REGISTRATION OFFICE IS ROUTINELY OPEN - FIRST MENTION

881283 HOURS OF THE DAY REGISTRATION OFFICE IS ROUTINELY OPEN - FIRST MENTION

881284 DAYS OF THE WEEK REGISTRATION OFFICE IS ROUTINELY OPEN - SECOND MENTION

881285 HOURS OF THE DAY REGISTRATION OFFICE IS ROUTINELY OPEN - SECOND MENTION

881286 ARE HOURS EXTENDED BEFORE AN ELECTION

881287 EXTENDED HOURS - DAY OF THE WEEK - FIRST MENTION

881288 EXTENDED HOURS - HOURS OF THE DAY - FIRST MENTION

881289 DURATION OF EXTENDED HOURS - FIRST MENTION

881290 EXTENDED HOURS - DAY OF THE WEEK - SECOND MENTION

881291 EXTENDED HOURS - HOURS OF THE DAY - SECOND MENTION

881292 DURATION OF EXTENDED HOURS - SECOND MENTION

881293 EXTENDED HOURS - DAY OF THE WEEK - THIRD MENTION

881294 EXTENDED HOURS - HOURS OF THE DAY - THIRD MENTION

881295 DURATION OF EXTENDED HOURS - THIRD MENTION

881296 IS THERE A PUBLICATION THAT EXPLAINS REGISTRATION ELIGIBILITY AND PROCEDURES

881297 MAY INTERVIEWER HAVE A COPY

881298 RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT TO REGISTER - DAYS

#### INTERVIEWER NOTES

881299 INTERVIEWER ALLOWED TO HANDLE THE RECORDS

881300 INFORMATION RETRIEVAL WAS DONE BY SOMEONE ELSE OPERATING A COMPUTER

881301 INTERVIEWER'S RATING OF OFFICE ORGANIZATION, ACCESSIBILITY, AND ACCURACY OF RECORDS